REUNION AND ROME

BY THE REV.

PERCY DEARMER, M.A.

Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

J. N. Harding

NOV 28 RECD

Reunion and Rome

BY THE

REV. PERCY DEARMER, M.A.

WITH PREFATORY LETTER

BY HIS GRACE

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON: 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.
OXFORD: 9 High Street

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

First Impression, 1910

283
D285

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.
April 23, 1910.

DEAR MR. DEARMER,

I have read with interest and, generally speaking, with warm approval the advance copy of your little book on Reunion and Rome.

You do not ask or expect me to give to it an official *imprimatur*. Such is not our way of procedure, and there are arguments or statements here and there which I should myself have expressed a little differently. But I have no hesitation in saying that I regard the little book as a valuable contribution to our popular literature on a grave subject. I am sure that you are wise in reprinting, for the use of many who might not otherwise see them, the careful words of the recent Lambeth Conference and of its Committee.

Your book will, in a simple way, meet a real need, and I cordially wish it God speed.

I am,
Yours very truly,
RANDALL CANTUAR:

ISTIC
31151

Note

THE question discussed in this book is one which concerns every Englishman, in common with the citizens of other Christian countries, whatever their religious opinions may be. The author has therefore endeavoured not to obscure the simplicity of the main issues by overmuch discussion of detail; for, in an age of reconstruction like our own, clear thinking and a common grasp of simple fundamental principles are urgently needed. References are given to books and pamphlets which are readily accessible as well as trustworthy and learned, in order that the general reader may be able easily to follow up any question which he may desire to study more fully: more especially the reader is referred to that worthy monument of a great historian, the Church Historical Society, which was founded by Bishop Creighton in 1894. The pamphlets issued by this society cover most of the ground, and give in accessible form a mass of information about which the scholars of Europe and America are agreed: they are published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.

Contents

Chap.		Page
1.	BELIEF IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH	1
2.	THE GROWTH OF THE PAPAL THEORY	10
3.	THE DECLINE OF THE PAPACY	14
4.	TRUE AND FALSE UNITY	22
5.	THE CATHOLIC FAITH	31
6.	FEDERAL UNITY	41
Appendix I.	THE FEDERAL PRINCIPLE	57
II.	THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1908 ON REUNION	68

Reunion and Rome

CHAPTER 1

Belief in the Catholic Church

WE are passing into an age of reconciliation. The controversies of the past begin already to savour somewhat of barbarism. Divided though Christendom is, men are no longer proud of those divisions, nor do they love them any longer. Our schisms are a heritage of the past; we could not have made them in an age like the present.

Although we bear the weight of schism in the twentieth century, it is not because we enjoy it. Those ages, now long past, which we sometimes think of as the era of unity, produced our unhappy divisions; and we, in an era of separation, are beginning to feel the unity of the Spirit and to seek after the bond of peace.

For there is progress in the world, since God has a plan for humanity. With many errors, catastrophies, and temporary losses, there is progress in truth and light: good things, it is true, have often been hastily thrown away,

and Western Christendom has by no means yet recovered all that it lost; yet it would be a greater loss to go back, since we are wiser, saner, more charitable, with an immensely greater knowledge than our ancestors possessed. We have enormously enlarged the borders of ascertained truth; and in doing so we are very generally acquiring the white honesty of the scientific spirit. We have learnt to love the truth better for its own sake; and, because we love the truth, we are no longer able to believe that any section or party can have a monopoly of it.

In other words, both in our sympathies and our opinions, we Christians are becoming more Catholic. What wonder then that we seek for the unity of Christendom?

"*I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.*" We are drawing on to that faith which was proclaimed when the Church was yet undivided. The men are becoming fewer every day who seek the fullness of truth, or expect to find it, in the controversial proclamations of this or that local Church. It is in the experience of all Christendom that we shall find the perfection and balance of the Christian religion. It is in the whole Body that we shall find the working of Christ the Head; nor was it to less than the whole Body that the abiding inspiration of God was promised.

Our love and our loyalty then are due to the Church Universal. We will believe in nothing less.

"*I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.*" Now,

it is just because we believe in the whole Church that we cannot be Roman Catholics. For the Roman Catholic is bound to believe in that part only of the Church which is in communion with the see of Rome, and which is in entire submission to the Bishop of Rome.

To believe only in the Roman Church is to prefer the part to the whole.

Thus we have to come into controversy, because this exclusive belief prevents the union of Christ's Church. We need not quarrel with the belief unless it be exclusive. We do not find fault with Roman Christians because they believe in their own Church, but because they are forbidden to believe in the whole Church ; and we rejoice to know that there is an increasing number of thoughtful men on the Continent who are growing out of this limited belief—Roman Catholics who are really Catholic Romans. Like ourselves, these men have discovered that it is the Papal Curia which stands in the way, and not the Church which it dominates. We can indeed distinguish with them between the Papacy and the Roman Catholic Church ; and in opposing the one we need not cease to love the other. For the Roman Church is part of Christ's Body: it has produced many great saints, it has done immense service in the world, it contains much that is admirable and lovely. It is part of Christ's Body, bearing special witness to many excellencies, and Christendom would indeed be incomplete without it.

Only, we are obliged to find fault with the

position assumed by the Papacy, because that position has been the cause of the Church's disruption, and is still the main obstacle to reunion. We need not blame Roman Catholics because of this; their mistake is natural and human. But we must work for its removal by the spread of knowledge. It is good that they should love their own part of the Church, and believe in it. Their mistake is that they do not believe also in the Church Catholic.

This is rather like a Yorkshireman believing only in his own county, or a Scotsman refusing to have anything to do with the rest of Great Britain. We do not blame the Scotsman's local patriotism; on the contrary, we esteem it an admirable thing, fully justified by the facts: but if Scotland should refuse to have any dealings with England and Wales, and should assert that it alone was Great Britain, we should be plunged in a state of separation and warfare; and we should have to work for a removal of the delusion, just because we believe in Great Britain.

So it is with the Roman part of the Church. There is enough in it, admirable and fine, to justify the devotion of its members. We do not wish to hunt out its faults or to rake up old grievances, since the more Christian duty will be to look for our own faults and to forgive others as we hope to be forgiven. Only, from natural causes which history reveals, the Papacy has gradually drifted into a position which is impossible.

It claims to represent the unity of the Church.

But on what grounds? Only on the ground of its own assumption that those from whom it has separated do not belong to the Church. This is like a schoolmaster (we might even call him a headmaster to satisfy our Roman friends, for the sake of argument) who should draw off his own class from the rest of the school, and then should say that his class *is* the school. If the rest of the school objected—"But there are other classes," he would reply, if he adopted the Papal argument,—"It is quite simple. You have only all to join my class; and then the school will be one again."

The Roman class claims, in fact, to be the Catholic Church. But what is the Church? Beyond any doubt every one who is baptized is admitted into the Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church consists of the whole company of Christian people, in this world and the next. This is the Body; and the whole Body exists by virtue of its union with Christ, who is the Head.

This is what we believe in—the Holy Catholic Church, and in nothing smaller or less universal. The Eastern Churches belong to it, and the Anglican Churches, and Protestants as well as Roman Catholics. When the representatives of the whole Church speak, the Church speaks; but the representatives of one part have no power to speak for the whole—any more than one political party could claim to be the whole State by saying that no other party has a right to vote. If they do make this claim, they are compelled, as the

Roman Church unfortunately is, to maintain that the other parts are so infected with heresy and schism as to have forfeited the rights of their baptism and to be no longer parts of the Church at all.

That is a terrible position. We may think the government of some Christians defective, or their opinions mistaken; but if they have been admitted into the Catholic Church in the Lord's own way and follow his teaching in the Gospels, to treat them as outside the Church is to treat our Lord's great Sacrament as of no account, and to impose tests of membership which he did not impose.

It may still of course be urged that certain Christian bodies, certain parts of the Church, have so fallen into heresy and schism that they are cut off from participation in the Church's life. Now it is no business of mine here to judge other Christian bodies, nor do I find in the Gospel any warrant for that love of scenting out heresy which is still only too common amongst us. It would be a more Christian and a more Catholic task to emphasise the remarkable extent to which all Christians are agreed in believing the articles of the Creed. But as an Anglican I am only here concerned with this question—"Has the Anglican Church fallen into heresy or schism, so that it is cut off from the life of the Church Catholic?"

The answer is simple. The Anglican Church has not fallen into *Heresy*, for she accepts the Catholic Creeds, and has always steadily appealed to the Scriptures as interpreted by

the Fathers.[1] A Church might indeed accept the Creeds, and yet add new doctrines as articles of faith, and thus fall into heresy; but this is just what the Anglican Church has not done, and what the Roman Church has done, *e.g.* by adding the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith, although men like St. Augustine, St. Bernard, and St. Thomas Aquinas, were strongly opposed to it. Indeed the Creeds are not enough for Roman Catholics: they are *obliged* to believe on pain of eternal damnation many things which are not in the Creeds and were not believed by the Fathers.

So, if it be heresy to be content with the Faith once for all delivered unto the Saints,[2] we are in heresy; if it be heresy to insist on the Creeds and to hold with the Fathers of the Church, we are in heresy. But not otherwise.

Nor has the Anglican Church fallen into *Schism*. She has preserved the same ministry as the Roman and the Eastern Churches of bishops, priests, and deacons; and, thus organised both before and after the Reformation, she has never committed a single act of schism.[3] She has never separated herself from any part of Christendom. The schism at the Reformation was made by Rome, when in 1570 the Pope issued a Bull excommunicating all who took

[1] See p. 36.

[2] Jude 3.

[3] As arguments against the Holy Orders of the Anglican Church are still pressed among the less educated Roman Catholics, and believed in by them, it may be well to refer again to the pamphlets of the Church Historical Society, and especially to Nos. I, VI, VIII, XIV—XX: also to H. O. Wakeman's *History of the Church of England* (Rivingtons), and Bishop Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims* (Rivingtons).

part in our Church services. Even then the English Church did not retaliate. She has never repudiated Rome.[1] She has closed no doors, but has preserved the broad and tolerant temper of true Catholicism ; and there is nothing on our side to prevent the Pope of Rome and the Patriarch of Moscow from receiving the Holy Communion next Sunday with the Archbishop of Canterbury at the high altar of St. Paul's Cathedral.[2]

It is not then because we are heretical or schismatic or uncatholic that the Roman Church regards us as having forfeited the rights of our Baptism, and herself as being alone the Church Universal. It is because she has invented a new test of what constitutes a Churchman. The Roman Church, a minority of Christendom,[3] has, without consulting the majority, made up a test of her own, and says—*not* "If you do not comply with this test, you do not belong to *me*," (that perhaps would be legitimate, though unwise,) *but*—"If you do not comply with this test, you do not belong to the Church at all."

This is the very opposite of Catholicism: this is narrowness and sectarianism. This lands all Christendom in an *impasse*. And, when we are distressed at the hatred which many good people feel towards a great and

[1] See *e.g.* Canon 30, 1604, "so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France," etc.

[2] See *Unity, Catholic and Papal*, by Dr. W. E. Collins, Bishop of Gibraltar, p. 59. Church Historical Society, No. XXV (London, S.P.C.K.) 1897. [3] See p. 19.

ancient Church like that of Rome, opposing beautiful or innocent practices and ceremonies with great bitterness merely because they are or seem Roman, we must remember that they have some excuse; for the Papal position does often make Christian charity very difficult, and does create profound opposition, bitterness, mistrust, and division.

CHAPTER 2

The Growth of the Papal Theory

IT is mostly when we study history that we learn to put aside anger and to recover that charity which is the very essence of Catholicism. These Roman claims grew up gradually and naturally. The early Bishops of Rome were innocent of them. The Catholic Church knew nothing of them.[1] The ancient Church of the East never accepted them, even while it was still in communion with Rome, as it was till 1054. It was not indeed the wicked Popes, but the good ones who extended the Papal power; men like Leo the Great († A.D. 461) the founder of the Papacy,[2] Gregory the Great (†604), Hildebrand (†1085), Innocent III (†1216), who felt that a strong central authority was needed to quell the violence of those eight turbulent centuries of gradual civilisation.[3]

[1] Three Bishops of Rome, so far from being infallible, were found guilty of heresy: Liberius signed the Arian creed; Vigilius was condemned by one General Council; Honorius was condemned and anathematised by name as a heretic by three General Councils.

[2] The 'forward movement' of St. Leo was of course vigorously resisted in the Church, especially by St. Hilary, Archbishop of Arles, and by the Council of Chalcedon. See *e.g.* A. Carr, *The Church and the Roman Empire*, pp. 199–206. (Epochs of Church History), London, Longmans, 1902.

[3] The general reader may be referred to the masterly sketch in the Introduction to Creighton's *History of the Papacy* (Longmans).

Thus the Papal power grew, because there was a practical need of it. At first these claims were modest and tolerable compared with what they are now; in such an age as that of St. Gregory the natural leadership of the Roman Bishop brought many blessings to Western Christendom. But by the time of Hildebrand the claims had already become so dangerous that before he was made Pope, the Western part of the Church was separated from the East. And from henceforward the English Church, as well as other parts of the West, was often in conflict with the see of Rome. The conflict culminated in the second great schism at the Reformation. But Rome herself, now separated from her critics, became yet more definite in her claims, and formulated them in the Council of Trent.[1]

Gradually her theory had become that the unity of the Church depends upon its having in addition to our Lord Jesus Christ, a visible head, the Bishop of Rome, and that this prelate (though only elected by the Roman minority of Christendom) is the centre of unity, and since 1870 the infallible standard of religious truth, and that no one is in communion with the Church who is not in communion with the Pope and in complete submission to his dictation.

It is very simple, very natural when we

[1] It may be well here to refer the general reader who wishes to know the main facts of Church History to the series of small books, *Epochs of Church History*, Ed. M. Creighton (Longmans), and also to the 8 vols. of *The History of the English Church*, Ed. W. R. W. Stephens and W. Hunt (Macmillan).

remember the history of its growth. Only it is not true, and it has not promoted unity. And it is becoming less and less acceptable to the civilised world.

The test imposed by the Roman Church since 1870 is indeed a very simple one. To enjoy the benefits of his Baptism, to be a member of the Catholic Church, and to escape eternal damnation, a man must believe the Infallibility of the Pope and submit entirely to him.[1]

How different from the tests of true discipleship which are given in the Gospels! Yet when a Roman Catholic says, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," he means only that he believes in the Pope and in those who accept this monstrous test which is but forty years old.

It is then because we do believe in the Holy Catholic Church that we dare not, if we would, narrow down the Body of Christ to the Papal dimensions.

The Papal claims, now crystalized in the dogma of Infallibility, have been growing for many centuries. Have they promoted the unity of the Church? They were only in their infancy and tender youth so long as the Church was still visibly united. As they grew, they brought division. First, the Eastern Church and the Western Church were broken in twain in 1054. Then, after five more centuries, the Western Church at the Reformation was itself divided, because half those still in com-

[1] For an accurate description of this dogma, and a criticism of it, see Bishop Arthur T. Lyttleton, *Papal Infallibility* (Church Historical Society).

munion with Rome could not endure the Papal attempts at despotism. And what do we find at the present day in Roman Catholic countries? The same process of disintegration, because men find the Papal claims intolerable. France has repudiated the Church; Italy is at open war with the Vatican, and the city of Rome stands in official antagonism to the Pope who had dominated her for so long.

Sincerely and with most thorough devotion the attempt has been made by the Papal Court to secure unity by autocracy and orthodoxy by coercion. Many centuries have been devoted to the experiment. It failed over half Western Europe at the Reformation; and the leadership of the world passed to those nations that rejected it. It is failing over the remainder to-day.

So far from the Papal theory being a bond of unity, it has proved a hammer which has smashed Christendom into fragments.

CHAPTER 3

The Decline of the Papacy

THIS fact, that the Roman claims are becoming rapidly more intolerable to the whole civilised world, and not least to those parts which are still called Roman Catholic, is so important that it demands a chapter to itself. What the Eastern Orthodox Church did in the 11th century, what the English Church, with half Europe did in the 16th century, is now being done in those countries which remained at the Reformation in submission to the Roman See. They also are repudiating the Papal claims, though not in the same way; for, having been brought up to believe that the choice is 'Rome or Nothing,' and that there is no real Christianity except that of Rome, they have largely revolted against Christianity altogether.

We may make all possible deductions and allowances, we may plead that there was a general wave of irreligion in the Nineteenth Century, and that other Churches also have suffered; but the fact remains, pertinent to our argument, that the Papacy is still declining.

It is thus an entire mistake to imagine, as

many still do, that the revolt against Rome was a peculiarity of the Reformation period and has since stopped. On the contrary, far more people left the Roman Communion in the Nineteenth century than in the Sixteenth. The rulers of France, for instance, at the Reformation killed and drove out the French Reformers with such thoroughness that it remained a Roman Catholic country. But what has happened since? During the last 50 years, while the population of France has increased by 3 millions, the Roman Catholic population has sunk from 30 millions to about 6 millions.[1] Whatever allowances we make for a large body of people who are not practising Catholics and yet retain some ties with the Church, it is admitted on all sides that the decline has been enormous.

Spain and Italy are moving rapidly in the same direction. Even in South Germany, which has the best record, it is possible for a careful writer to estimate the loss at not less than 5 millions.

For details the reader may be referred to Mr. McCabe's book,[2] since it supplies the most recent as well as the most carefully compiled statistics, and these are mostly taken from

[1] M. Paul Sabatier, in his *Lettre ouverte à S. E. le Cardinal Gibbons*, p. 21 (Paris, Fischbacher, 1907), says that "men who speak with authority on this matter assure us that the number of French Catholics is not more than three or four millions." Mr. McCabe (*The Decay of the Church of Rome*, Cap. II) estimates the present number of Roman Catholics in France at 5½ millions.

[2] Joseph McCabe, *The Decay of the Church of Rome* (London, Methuen, 1909).

Roman Catholic and official sources. Figures do not of course prove everything ; but in this case other considerations emphasise rather than mitigate the impression of decline,—the moral and intellectual weakness,[1] the revolt of so many of the most eminent Roman Catholic thinkers in the Modernist movement of recent years, the fact that about half of those still in the Church of Rome are illiterates, the enormous extension in the world of the non-Roman peoples—the Russians, the Anglo-Saxons, and the Teutonic races.

A few millions one way or the other make little difference when a dry and serious writer like Mr. McCabe is able to challenge the world with figures such as these :—

Total loss of the Roman Church in 70 years —80,000,000.

Present total number of Roman Catholics —188,650,230.

Present total number of all Christendom —550,000,000.

It seems not too much to say that Roman Catholic countries are disappearing from the

[1] See *e.g.* the record in Paul Sabatier, *A propos de la Séparation des Églises et de l'État*, Paris, Fischbacher, 2nd ed., 1906; or the Montagnini revelations in *Les Fiches Pontificales de Monsignor Montagnini*, Paris, Nourry, 1908. With this may be compared the measured judgement of France's greatest modern historian and critic, in the 6th volume of Taine's *Origines de la France contemporaine*, 1894, and his estimate of the causes which even then were so ominous—the religious despotism especially, and the unhealthy devotions whose character is "inintelligible, bizarre ou même choquant pour le grand public" (p. 146).

map of the world. If the above estimate be at all correct, and the present rate of shrinkage be maintained, the whole Roman Church will have disappeared in less than two centuries. That prospect is indeed almost impossible to contemplate, and we cannot but believe that God's providence will prevent so awful a loss to the cause of religion. A recovery must come, but it is becoming probable that the Roman Church will recover only by repudiating the yoke of Papalism, as every other Church has done. For there is already a profound struggle among thoughtful Roman Catholics against the numbing decrees of the Papal Curia, and this spirit of resistance is spreading among the younger clergy.

Be that as it may, the main fact of a terrible loss has certainly been acknowledged over and over again by the most prominent Roman Catholics. What, for instance, could be sadder than the following statement of the present Pope, Pius X, in his first Encyclical?—

> "The present most afflicted condition of mankind did exceedingly affright us. For who does not know that now, more than in all past ages, the society of men is stricken by a most grave and deep disease, which, growing daily graver and eating it utterly away, hurries it to ruin?
>
> "It must needs be that he who ponders on these things will fear lest this perversity of men's minds may be, as it were, a foretaste and a beginning of the evils that are to be looked for in the last days."

We, whose own outlook is so much brighter, can but regret bitterly this awful decline of religion among Roman Catholic peoples. Christianity itself is being destroyed in the Latin countries. But we may point out also that it does prove the hopelessness of the Roman position. The Papal claims are being rejected by Roman Catholics at such a rate that the Roman Church has lost nearly a third of her dominion since the time when Cardinal Newman laid his great gifts at her feet.

In those days it was possible for Roman Catholics to say,—"Join us: we shall grow rapidly, and we shall bring about the reunion of Christendom by everybody submitting to the Pope. See how many people are giving up Protestantism: it is no good remaining in that dismantled city: there will soon be no other side to make terms with: you had better walk into our camp."

It was possible in the middle of the last century to argue like that; for there was a great reaction against mere barren Protestant controversialism, a widespread revival of Catholic feeling, and those many people who thought that Catholicism meant Roman Catholicism expected that the Papacy must gain. A great deal of the bitterness also against Rome was passing away; and intelligent Anglicans and Protestants were learning how much was admirable and beautiful in ideas that were chiefly known in connection with Roman Catholicism.

It seemed that Rome must gain heavily. There was some plausibility in the plea that the best thing was for everybody to come over to her as quickly as possible. Indeed till recently most Roman Catholics honestly imagined that she was making up for her admitted losses in her own Latin countries by a reconversion of the Anglo-Saxon peoples. There is still a general impression that her vigorous and untiring proselytism in England and America has met with great success.

Now if the schoolmaster of our parable, who has drawn off his own class and says that this alone represents the school, were after a while to find that the rest of the school was gradually coming over to him, then it would be natural for him to say to the recalcitrant minority that the only way to restore peace was for them to come over too.

But the exact contrary is the case. Even the older statistics showed that it was with a recalcitrant *majority* that Rome had to deal[1]; but the statistics now show that the non-Roman majority is becoming enormously larger than the remnant that still submits to the Pope—a remnant of some 190 millions out of a total of over 500 million Christians in the world.

And the notion that Rome was gaining in England and America must now be put away. The loss to the Roman Catholic Church in the

[1] e.g. *Whitaker's Almanac* for 1897 gave Rome 216 millions and the rest of Christendom 232 millions out of a total of 448 million Christians in the world.

British Empire and the United States has been huge. This is the estimate :—[1]

In Great Britain the Roman Church has lost about -	2,250,000	souls.
In Canada the Roman Church has lost about -	700,000	,,
In Australasia the Roman Church has lost about -	550,000	,,
In the United States the Roman Church has lost about - - - -	14,000,000	,,
Total loss - -	17,500,000	,,

It is useless therefore for any one nowadays to imagine that he will promote the peace and reunion of Christendom by joining the swiftly shrinking remnant of those who still accept the claims of the Papacy. The Church is not to be reunited that way. On the contrary, the secession of individuals from the Anglican Communion causes fresh bitterness and dissension, increases Protestant mistrust, and weakens the general cause of Catholicism. One has only to study the friendly feelings which Englishmen have for the Eastern Church, and the brotherly intercourse which takes place between us and them, to realise how much the cause of reunion gains by the absence of proselytism. Because Greek and Russian Catholics do not seek to turn Anglicans from their loyalty, Christian intercourse

[1] McCabe, *Ibid.* p. 195. The process by which these figures are reached is given in pp. 128–195.

with them is already an accomplished fact, and reunion a matter for hopeful discussion.[1]

We were warned by our Lord against the temper of those who compass sea and land to make one proselyte.[2] To judge from the facts of the last half-century, it is a temper that does no good to those who give way to it, and brings no success. It is an uncatholic temper; and those Churches are promoting a charitable and united Christendom which are content not to spread dissension among brethren who already follow the Gospel, but to go out and preach it among those who have it not.

The Anglican Communion has a special duty in promoting the unity of Christendom, as well as in the recovery of those who have been lost to religion, because it has a special opportunity. In the providence of God it holds a central position; and the stronger that central position grows, the greater will be the possibility of drawing together those who are now far asunder, and the brighter the hope for a reunion of Christendom.

[1] See Appendix II, p. 78.

[2] Matt. 23. 15.

CHAPTER 4

True and False Unity

THIS Papal idea, which has rent Christendom asunder and now threatens so ominously to destroy the Roman Church itself, is a false idea of unity. Roman Catholicism is not, as people sometimes imagine, particular ceremonies or customs—such as elaborate services or devotion to the Saints, which are also characteristic of the Eastern Church, and therefore are certainly not specially Roman; nor is it even those exaggerations of this or that practice or doctrine which are peculiar to the Roman Church. Roman Catholicism is simply one-man rule: it is a despotic theory of Church order.

Quite literally it is a *despotism*, which word the dictionaries tell us means "absolute government." Still more exactly, it belongs to that class of despotisms which are called autocratic, an *autocracy* being "supreme power invested in a single person; the government or power of an absolute monarch." And it goes further than other autocracies in that it claims infallibility under certain conditions for the despot.

This accounts sufficiently for the way in which civilised nations are throwing off Roman

Catholicism. For indeed despotisms have had their day—even in Asia. A few years ago we should have had to admit that three autocracies did still survive in Europe, that of the Sultan, the Tsar, and the Pope. But now constitutional government has triumphed in Turkey, and has been introduced into Russia; so that the Papacy is the one pure autocracy surviving amongst us.

The Christian apologist is in the habit of pointing to the gradual substitution of brotherly order in the place of tyranny and the rule of brute force, wherever the Christian spirit has spread, and of claiming this as one of the most conspicuous instances of the divine truth and power of the Christian religion. He is right. Christianity stands or falls by this, that it is the revelation for all time of God's Fatherhood and Man's Brotherhood.

But here we must break off for a few pages to discuss the *Petrine* argument.

Papal apologists urge that the Pope, in the person of St. Peter, was established by Christ as the Head of the Church, when our Lord said—"Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church."[1]

If this saying had not been so long waved about as a kind of banner of Popery, one could hardly imagine any one seriously thinking that it had anything to do with Papal supremacy, except in showing how weak those claims must be that can only base themselves upon a meta-

[1] Matt. 16. 18.

phor.[1] But as it still is used in this way, we must briefly point out why the position has been long abandoned by scholars.[2]

(1) The great majority of the Fathers think that "this rock" refers to the faith in Jesus as the Son of God, and not to St. Peter at all.[3] So there is no Catholic consent as to the interpretation of the words. St. Paul indeed distinctly says that the Church was not founded upon any one Apostle alone, but was "built upon the foundation of the *Apostles and Prophets*, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."[4] That great Father, Origen, sums up the whole of the so-called Petrine texts thus :—

> "Can we dare to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter only, but that they will prevail against the other Apostles and those who are perfect? Are not the words quoted, 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,'[5] and 'upon this rock I will build my Church,' said of them all and of each single one of them? Are the keys of heaven given to Peter only, and shall no other of the blessed ones receive them?
>
> "And if the words, 'I will give to thee the

[1] Our Lord said "Get thee behind me, Satan" to St. Peter shortly after he had said "Thou art Peter" (Matt. 16. 23). Yet no one seriously argues that the Roman Church has inherited a diabolic character because of this metaphor.

[2] For a conspicuously fair examination of the whole Petrine argument, *Roman Catholic Claims*, by Dr. C. Gore, Bishop of Birmingham (Rivingtons), may be consulted.

[3] It has been computed that 44 of the Fathers interpret the "rock" to be this faith in the divinity of Jesus, and only 17 understand by it that Christ founded the Church on St. Peter. See Bishop Gore, *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[4] Eph. 2. 20. [5] Matt. 16. 18.

keys of the kingdom of heaven,'[1] are common to the others, are not also all the words that are said before and after, although they are said to Peter, also common to the others? For in this place the words, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,' etc., seem as if they were spoken to Peter; but in the Gospel of John,[2] the Saviour when he gives the Holy Spirit by the breath to the disciples says, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesover sins ye forgive, they are forgiven.'"[3]

(2) But, assuming that the "rock" does refer to St. Peter, as it very possibly did in the first case, the text only says that he was to be the foundation. What right has any one to assume that a man upon whom a society is founded must be its ruler,—still less, its autocrat?

(3) It is evident from the New Testament that St. Peter was as a matter of fact not head of the Church, and that he had no authority whatever over the rest of the Apostles. There was no earthly head to the Church; but if any figure stands out in the apostolic age with authority and command it is undoubtedly the grand figure of St. Paul, to whom the rest of the Apostles form a background that is very dim. And it is St. Paul who tells us that he resisted St. Peter "to the face," because he stood condemned.[4]

(4) When the Church met in Conference,[5] it was not St. Peter but St. James who presided,

[1] Matt. 16. 19. [2] John 20. 22–23.
[3] Origen, *In Matt.* Tom. XII. 11.
[4] Gal. 2. 11. [5] Acts 15.

and who decided the disputed point which was so vital to the future of Christendom; and St. James did this, not as an autocrat, but after consultation with the other apostles and the presbyters,[1] together with the whole church,[2] saying, "Wherefore my judgement is . . ."[3]

(5) The earliest Christian writers, like St. Clement of Rome and St. Irenaeus, speak of St. Peter and St. Paul as being *jointly* associated with the Church in Rome. It is certain that St. Paul went to Rome before St. Peter[4] and found a Church already there, and the Epistle to the Romans is from the hand of St. Paul. The rest is not certain, though probable. St. Paul was in Rome about A.D. 59, and probably asked St. Peter to help him there; and St. Peter probably worked with St. Paul in Rome from A.D. 61 to 64, in which year they were probably both martyred by Nero.[5]

But if we assume for the sake of argument that the fact of the two Apostles working together in Rome can really mean that St. Peter *was* the first 'bishop' of Rome, and if we assume that

[1] Acts 15. 6. [2] Ibid. 22. [3] Ibid. 19.

[4] To quote the most recent book on Church History, that of Professor Gwatkin:—"We lose sight even of Peter after the scene at Antioch [Gal. 2. 11]. It is certain that he travelled, and took his wife with him, and nearly certain that he had been at Corinth before 56 (1 Cor. 9. 5); but the silence of St. Paul and of the Acts is decisive proof that he had not visited Rome before 61. Thus the story of his twenty-five years episcopate is legendary for this reason as well as others."—H. M. Gwatkin, *Early Church History to A.D. 313*, I. p. 60. (London, Macmillan, 1909.)

[5] Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*: Articles "Peter (Simon)" by Dr. C. H. Chase, and "Chronology of New Testament" by Mr. C. H. Turner.

St. Peter *was* the sole foundation 'rock' of the Church, and if we assume (in direct contradiction to the evidence of the New Testament) that he *had* authority over the other Apostles, —where can we find any reason for further assuming that this authority could be handed on to all the other Bishops of Rome, merely because St. Peter had been the first to occupy that see? Why should all successive Bishops of Rome be each himself a little Peter?

(6) And assuming all this to be true, what reason would there still be for supposing that a position of authority should mean an absolute despotism? The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Eastern patriarchs enjoy to-day their ancient primacy, and their existence shows that headship need not mean absolutism, and that outside the Papacy constitutional government has existed all along. But the Papal position to-day requires all other bishops to be in entire subjection to the Bishop of Rome, and requires all Christians to accept him as infallible "under pain of eternal damnation." A Roman Catholic bishop must do what the Bishop of Rome tells him to do. When therefore the most learned Roman Catholic of the 19th century, Bishop Döllinger, refused to accept the new dogma of Papal Infallibility, he was excommunicated.

The whole position is then a tangle of impossible assumptions, based upon the notion that when our Lord said—"Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," he really meant—"Thou art Peter, and therefore all the bishops of Rome shall rule over my

Church for ever." Of course the Papal power did not really grow out of this text. The early bishops of Rome did not claim to have supreme authority, and the early Fathers and Councils did not look upon the bishops of Rome as their rulers. The Papal power grew because of the great traditions and exceptional power of the city of Rome, especially after the Emperors had left Rome and the *prestige* of the ancient rulers fell upon the bishop. The text was then made use of to justify the *fait accompli*.

It is an impossible idea that the office of "foundation" could be handed on, since a foundation is something that is laid once for all. But of course the office of pastor or shepherd can be, and has been—not by St. Peter alone, but by all the other Apostles and first ministers of the Church, whose office has been transmitted to the shepherds of the Church in all ages—the "overseers" and "elders" of the New Testament, "bishops" and "priests" as they are generally called in English, the ministers of the Gospel of Christ.[1]

There is no idea of headship in the Gospel,—or rather there is this one only idea, namely that the Church has no human head, but One "which is the head, even Christ," as St. Paul says in three places.[2]

So far indeed from establishing a ruler over the Church, our Lord foresaw the danger of one member lording it over the other; he re-

[1] "Overseer" in the Greek is *episcopos* which has been shortened into "bishop." "Elder" is *presbuteros* which has been shortened into "presbyter" and "priest."

[2] Eph. 1. 22, 4. 15, Col. 1. 18.

buked the Apostles when they contended which should be the greatest—"The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them . . . *but ye shall not be so*"[1]; he warned his disciples against recognizing any supremacy or accepting any, and it is strange that in this connection he used the very word "Father" or "Pope"[2] by which the Bishop of Rome is called:—

> "But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your teacher and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even the Christ."[3]

Never once is there any hint of the Roman idea. It is always indeed in the New Testament the exact opposite—"all ye are brethren," a brotherhood without an earthly Father, a fellowship in which each one is to serve,[4] and in which Christ is the only Master; a body in which earthly distinctions are done away, knit together in the unity of its divine Head; a society in which the various officers—apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers—serve together to the work of ministering.[5]

The Jerusalem which is above is *free*, which is the mother of us all.

Now this brotherhood, holy and free, is always one, in spite of our divisions. It is one

[1] Luke 22. 25–26.
[2] "Pope" is a form of "papa," "father."
[3] Matt. 23. 8–10.
[4] See *e.g.* Matt. 23. 11, and John 13. 12–17.
[5] Eph. 4. 11–12.

because it springs from the one Founder, because it is entered through the one gate of Baptism, because it is inspired by one and the selfsame Spirit, because it follows the one Shepherd, and is the Church of the one God. It is one, as the ocean is one, though there are many oceans and many seas; for the water circulates freely, though some seas are almost cut off by land. Yes, and as the Mediterranean would still be one with the ocean, though a boom were laid across the Straits of Gibraltar, so even now we are one with our brethren of the Roman Church and share the same life with them and lift up our hands with them to take the one Bread which cometh down from heaven.

The Church is one—as much *one* as she is *holy*—though her unity (like her holiness) is but imperfectly realized.

Therefore a foremost part of our Christian duty is not only to believe in the Catholic Church, but to believe in its oneness—"I believe *one* Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Believing this, we shall seek always for the signs of unity, and not of divergence; we shall strive to include and not to repudiate others; we shall look for beautiful and true things in those who are not of our own communion; we shall in all charity and sympathy work for the truth. For though there are still many *folds*, there is already "one *flock*, one Shepherd."[1]

[1] John 10. 16, R.V.

CHAPTER 5

The Catholic Faith

THE one Catholic Church has one Faith. What is this Catholic Faith? What is Catholicism? People so often narrow the Faith down by thinking of some particular aspect or development of it as being "Catholic": some think of what is Mediaeval, some of what is Modern Roman, some of what is Greek, and some of what is Anglican. They go into some church, and say, "That is very Catholic," really meaning that they saw a particular kind of ceremonial, or heard great emphasis laid on one or two doctrines which Protestants do not generally hold. I suppose they think of the rest of the Faith as merely Christian.

Yet that which we think of as just Christian is the main part of the Catholic Faith. *This* is the Catholic Faith, says the Athanasian Creed, after explaining the doctrine of the Godhead. "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God"[1] said the Ethiopian before he was baptised by St. Philip.

And the undivided Catholic Church was very chary about adding new definitions and dogmas to this central truth; although it was

[1] Acts 8. 37. (In marg. R.V.)

obliged to guard against misconceptions and errors by putting forth two formal Creeds, these—the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds—are wonderfully short and simple. If we thoroughly believe even the shorter of them, the Apostles' Creed, we hold the Catholic Faith.

Many true definitions, many good practices have developed from these in the long experience of the Church Universal: but different ages and different parts of the Church have emphasised different aspects of the Faith; and one has only to read a few theological books of various epochs to see how greatly the balance and proportion changes with different generations.

Local Churches, as well as individuals, have their favourite doctrines and forget other important things; so that in every age there is a want of universality. The Roman Church, for instance, obliges the laity to receive Communion in one kind only, and in quite modern times has developed a large number of strange beliefs and practices [1]; while on the Protestant side many fell into the grisly errors of Calvinism, and many ignored the Communion of Saints.

How are we to avoid such erratic and partial developments? How are we to be true to the Catholic Faith?

In the first place by always going back to the Christian Scriptures, and always testing by them our understanding of the Christian Creed. It has largely been ignorance of the New Tes-

[1] See, for some of these, *Some Features of Modern Romanism* (London, S.P.C.K., 1898).

tament among Roman Catholic people that has led to the strange unscriptural developments of the Roman Church.[1] The Catholic Faith is not something different from the New Testament: it *is* the Faith of the New Testament. If we believe what the Apostles believed we need have little fear of not being Catholics. "I believe one Catholic and *Apostolic* Church."

And to us who are looking for the reunion of Christendom, it is a supreme encouragement to see how, perhaps more than ever to-day, Christians of all sorts turn with renewed devotion to the Gospels, while even races and individuals that are as yet outside Christendom are being drawn more and more to the spirit of Christ, to his teaching and his example. We see the Catholic Faith being built up again from its foundations; we see the whole world turning to its Master. Even amid the bitter reactions, which the faults of the Church have produced, there are signs of recovery through the invincible attraction of our Lord.

Among Protestant Christians the great majority accept the Catholic Creeds, and no people are

[1] "It is a fact notorious and universal" wrote M. Henri Lasserre in the preface to his famous translation of the Gospels which was published with the recommendation of the Pope (though condemned after its 23rd edition), "and the primary cause of the diminution of the Christian spirit . . . that the Gospel . . . is very rarely read even by those who profess to be fervent Catholics." See C. Gore *Roman Catholic Claims*, cap. 3 (Rivingtons), and *Some Features of Modern Romanism*, cap. 1 (S.P.C.K.). "Catholics readily admit," wrote Cardinal Manning, "that they do not go to the text of Scripture for their devotion" (*Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, 1865, p. 201). cf. Cardinal Mercier's *Lettre Pastorale* 1908, and Fr. Tyrrell's comment thereon in his *Mediaevalism*, pp. 17–18, 28–30 (Longmans, 1908).

better instructed in the Bible or more devoted to it. The possibility of our all being united in the "one Faith" of the Catholic Church should not therefore be so difficult as we sometimes imagine.

"Let us face facts," says an eminent Catholic thinker,[1] who has lately died out of Communion with Rome—

> "The Way and the Life and the Truth have been made plain to the simplest from the very beginning. The truths by which our souls live and are sanctified are few, and are clear to all. About further points, theological uncertainty is not of the slightest direct spiritual consequence for the individual; it may often be more wholesome than certainty. And so to pretend that Christ ought to have and therefore must have provided for theological uniformity is to fly in the face of facts and to misapprehend the scope and meaning of the Gospel as summed up in the words: 'Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.'"

But, you may say, I may yet go wrong, in spite of the glorious simplicity of the Gospel, its breadth, its humanity, its manly strength, its profound truth. There are things I want to know that are not in the New Testament.

Far fewer things, we answer, than people imagine. What, for instance, is there in a High Celebration of the Holy Communion in the English Church that is not in the New Testa-

[1] Father George Tyrrell, *Mediaevalism*, p. 50 (Longmans, 1908).

ment? Its doctrine, its worship, its ceremonial are all there.[1]

Yet we do want to know what the Catholic interpretation of the New Testament is,—that is to say, what the united experience of the Church Universal in all ages has made of it.

This is what we want to know. This is what is truly and really Catholic.

And the answer is obvious and perfectly simple. That is truly Catholic which has been always and everywhere held.

Quod ubique, semper, et ab omnibus, is the famous rule of St. Vincent of Lerins, "that which is held everywhere, always, and by all"; and, to apply this test, he tells us to study the Scriptures as the text and the early writers as the expositors.[2] St. Thomas Aquinas, the great doctor of the later Middle Ages, follows exactly the same method.

That is the very meaning of the word "Catholic." It does not mean something narrow, and special, and peculiar; it means the exact opposite—that which is broad, inclusive, universal. The word "Catholic" only differs from "universal" in meaning *more*. Thus the Catholic Church means not only the Church Universal, but the Church whose inward character is one of universality.[3]

[1] The passages, e.g. in the Apocalypse, which mention this last, do not of course lay down the details, but only express the general principle of magnificence and beauty.

[2] For further information about St. Vincent's *Commonitorium* see Bishop C. Gore's chapter on "The Authority of the Church" in *Roman Catholic Claims*.

[3] Dr. Arthur James Mason, *The Faith of the Gospel* (Rivingtons, 1889), p. 248.

The particular definitions or practices of this or that particular Church, whether the Roman or any other, may be right or they may be wrong. The individual opinion even of the greatest Catholic Father may also be wrong: that teaching only has authority, says St. Vincent, first which has the authority of the General Councils,[1] and secondly which has been held, written, and taught by all the Fathers—the 'ancients' who "stand forth acknowledged and approved authorities"—"taught by all, equally, with one consent, openly, frequently, persistently."[2]

This then is the place of tradition in the Church. We can securely trust that as Catholic upon which the whole Church in all ages is agreed, because it represents the common experience of Christendom. This is also the method of modern science: we verify by experiment. No experiment can be compared with the Catholic experiment, which has been going on for nineteen centuries, and is still being made by every class and every race of mankind.

The passion for *Uniformity* has driven men asunder, and prevented Unity. For uniformity is outward and temporal, unity is inward and spiritual. Modern science and philosophy have given up the very idea of uniformity. We speak no longer of the uniformity of Nature, but of her unity. And indeed in the days when the Church was undivided there was no uniformity

[1] See pp. 46–8.

[2] *Commonitorium*, cap. 3; *cf.* caps. 27, 28, 29.

at all; nor did the desire for it grow up till schism had come with the Middle Ages. Christendom ought to have learnt the lesson by now; though, alas! the Roman Church has rushed to her decline by refusing to learn it and by enforcing uniformity in her borders with an iron hand.

We shall never get Uniformity; for it is against nature. But we shall recover Unity.

In necessariis unitas; in dubiis libertas; in omnibus caritas,—"In necessary things unity; in doubtful things liberty; in all things charity."

"In necessary things unity." Other things may be true. Our reason may tell us that they are true in the light of Christian experience, or in the light of modern knowledge. But we may not enforce them as a condition of membership upon others: we may perhaps think others unreasonable for not accepting them, but we must not think them unchristian or heretical.

These necessary things we find in the original Gospel of Jesus Christ. That is common ground upon which all Christians are professedly agreed. Other societies may legitimately add to their original teaching; but not the Church: her Founder is himself the Way in which she is to walk, himself the Truth which she has to teach, himself the Life by which she lives.[1]

This appeal, "Back to the New Testament," back that is, to Christ and to those immediate

[1] This is well shown in *The Teaching Power of the Church*, by Dr. W. E. Collins, Bishop of Gibraltar (Church Historical Society).

disciples who best knew his mind, was the strength and the justification of the Reformation movement, in spite of the mistakes that were made in applying it, in spite of wrong theories of Scriptural infallibility, and of the Judaism that resulted from an exaggerated view of the Old Testament. And indeed there were mistakes enough on both sides for the mere partisan to gloat over; but the principle here was right, and was Catholic.

This principle of returning to our Founder's express teaching is necessary also to right development. People sometimes imagine that by justifying an elaborate theology as a 'development' they are using the language of modern science. Now it may or may not be true that man is evolved from a primeval fish; but if it be, it is equally true that donkeys and parrots are derived from the same aquatic ancestry. We can account for everything by development; but the practical question remains—"What direction has the development taken?" So it is that in religion, as in philosophy, we have to go back along our path to see that we have not strayed from the right direction. Romanism is indeed a development; but so also, and just as much, is Protestantism. Indeed all forms of Christianity are developments. Only some have taken a better direction than others.

The method, then, of appealing back to Christ and to the New Testament where his mind is revealed, not only preserves our loyalty to his teaching, but also secures our

freedom. It prevents the Catholic religion being overlaid with an ever increasing accumulation of beliefs and ceremonies that have appeared vital to one age, but to another become in their mass a bondage too burdensome to be borne. By the appeal to Christ a Church can clear away its debris; and thus from one part of the Church to the other the power can pass of cleansing, simplification, and recovery.

"In doubtful things liberty." There is a faith once for all delivered to the saints: there are, besides, many things which are legitimate deductions from this Gospel, or which seem to be—some things which are to us almost inevitable deductions. Such things the Catholic Faith neither enforces nor excludes: for real Catholicism is above all things tolerant and inclusive; and Catholic unity, as St. Augustine says, embraces in her motherly breast those who think differently.[1] A Church ceases to be inclusive if it demands 'developments' as a condition of membership: it ceases to be tolerant if, on the other hand, it attempts forcibly to suppress them.

The necessary things, then, are far fewer than many suppose. In them we can again be at one, in the New Testament interpreted by the Creeds, in that common faith which has been the Church's heritage from the first.

[1] Augustine, *De Baptismo*, II 3–6, v. 25. He instances St. Cyprian choosing rather to have communion with heretics and schismatics than to be separated from unity, and quotes that Saint—"Judging no one, and depriving no one of the right of communion if he differ from us."

And "though we," says St. Paul,[1] "or an angel from heaven should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema."

[1] Gal. 1. 8.

CHAPTER 6

Federal Unity

WE have spoken of the Church, the visible Church, militant here in earth, as already one. How shall Christendom remove the barriers that have been laid across her here and there by human folly, impatience, uncharitableness, and wickedness?

The unity exists. How can the barriers be removed which prevent its realisation?

The answer is simple. By returning to the Catholic order of the Church, the system that existed in New Testament times and as long as the Church was undivided, that is to say, through the first thousand years of Christian history.

This Catholic plan is *Federation.* It is the only plan, order, or system that has been found compatible with Church unity.

Thus the two systems stand opposed to one another. The Catholic system of Federation; the Papal system of Despotism,—brotherhood on the one hand, tyranny on the other. The Catholic plan maintained unity; the Papal destroyed it.

We have already remarked that Despotisms are an impossibility in modern states where education has spread. How then are great empires kept together? The Government under George III caused the schism between

England and the United States by an attempt at Despotism; since then England has preserved the rest of the Empire in unity by Federation, while the great nation that was lost has maintained its own solidarity by being precisely a federation of States that are United.

This political illustration will serve to make our meaning clear. It is, of course, only an illustration, since the Church is a spiritual body, different from any secular state, in her oneness and universality. Federated states have unity in essentials, liberty in unessentials, and charity to a remarkable extent in all things. They are one: together they form a great nation or empire; yet they have their own rights of self-government.

It is a fact too little known that the modern idea of representative government was also the idea and the practice of the early Church.[1] Bishops and priests were alike elected by the people; and election from below is emphasised by patristic writers sometimes as hardly less important than commission from above — *de universae fraternitatis suffragio et de episcoporum judicio.* The early Church was in fact faithful to New Testament principles—

> "And the saying pleased the *whole multitude*: and *they chose* Stephen . . . whom they set before *the apostles*: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them."[2]

Still less is it realised that the federal idea,

[1] Dr. Gore, Bishop of Birmingham, *The Ministry of the Christian Church*, pp. 97–107 (London, Murray, 1889).
[2] Acts 6. 5, 6.

that other safeguard of modern civilisation, was also the practice of the early Church, a practice which survived in the West long after episcopal election had become a form, and has never ceased in the Orthodox Church of the East.

It is of course possible to misrepresent this Catholic principle of federation as if it were merely a loose bond of connection for practical convenience between bodies essentially separate. The real modern political counterpart to that, however, is not federation at all, but alliance between alien nations—not the British Empire, for instance, but the Triple Alliance. The Catholic principle, on the contrary, is the expression of unity. There is One Church; and therefore, before the Schism between East and West, the local Churches (whether as dioceses, or groups of dioceses into provinces or patriarchates, matters little [1]) could develop freely, and could dare to be themselves without fear of division, because their unity was secure, until the growth of the despotic idea drove them asunder.

[1] In the 2nd century the Churches of great civil capitals like Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage had naturally great influence. In 325 the Council of Nicaea allowed to the bishop of the capital in every civil province (not Rome only) a right of veto in the appointment of any bishop in the province. This *metropolitan* or archiepiscopal system became firmly established in the 4th century; thus Alexandria was the metropolitan see of the Egyptian provinces, and Rome of the Italian. But this clustering of neighbouring bishopries round a metropolis did not obtain over the whole Church: some parts were not grouped into patriarchates, and the *diocese* (not the province) remained, as it still is to-day, the unit of the Catholic Church. To take a Western example near home, Scotland never had an archbishop until 1472, nor has the Scottish Episcopal Church had one since 1708.

The New Testament records only the beginnings of Church organisation ; but already we have the principle of federal unity at work. Local Churches were founded wherever the faith was spread, and we read of a Church at Corinth, with the saints in the whole of Achaia,[1] the Churches of Macedonia,[2] the Churches of Galatia,[3] the Churches of Asia,[4] — seven Churches, in Ephesus, in Smyrna, in Pergamum, in Thyatira, in Sardis, in Philadelphia, in Laodicea[5]—and also of "they of Italy."[6] Yet there is no doubt whatever that these particular Churches were all parts of the One Church, the one Body of Christ.[7]

Because of their unity, these local Churches were closely associated with each other, though none was over the other. The nearest approach to any pre-eminence is shown first in the case of the Church of Jerusalem, where on one occasion we already find the principle at work that led later to the institution of General Councils for the whole Church—the principle, namely, that when dissensions arise they are to be met by combined action of the Church as a whole.[8]

In subsequent ages the unity of the whole Church is increasingly realised, but the liberty and individuality of the local Churches remain.

[1] 2 Cor. 1. 1.
[2] Ibid. 8. 1.
[3] 1 Cor. 16. 1, Gal. 1. 2.
[4] 1 Cor. 16. 19.
[5] Rev. 1. 11, 2–3.
[6] Heb. 13. 24.
[7] See especially the Epistle to the Ephesians on the unity of the Church.
[8] Acts 15. The decision of the gathering at Jerusalem was taken to Antioch, and to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia "for to keep." Acts 15. 30, 16. 4.

They have their own customs and methods of government: even the ministry varies at first in different Churches. This gradually becomes fixed. St. Cyprian († A.D. 258) regards the local bishop as the centre of unity — "one bishop, one church."[1] St. Jerome († 420) shows, at a time when the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople enjoyed a high pre-eminence owing to the importance of their imperial cities,[2] that no bishop is set over another :—

> "Wherever a bishop may be, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople, or Rhegium, at Alexandria or Tanis, he has the same worth, the same priesthood. Neither the influence of wealth nor the lowliness

[1] See *e.g.* Cyprian, *Ep.* 43. 5. A forged passage about union "with the chair of Peter" is still sometimes quoted by controversialists. Like the famous Forged Donation and the False Decretals it was honestly believed in the Middle Ages. For Cyprian's position in general see Bishop Gore's *Ministry of the Christian Church*, pp. 165–9, and Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian*. For a criticism of Cyprian's views see Prof. Gwatkin's *Early Church History*, cap. 24. For the whole early period see Bishop Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, Professor Bigg's *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, and Professor Glover's *Conflict of Religions*.

[2] Roman Catholic controversialists sometimes lay stress on the instances which show the high esteem enjoyed by the local Church of Rome in early days, as if such instances supported the idea of a papacy. (If the reader wishes to see this matter discussed with great impartiality, he can refer to Dr. A. Robertson, *Roman Claims to Supremacy*, Church Historical Society). It would be strange indeed if the see of the ancient imperial city had not held a high position. The Archbishop of Canterbury holds to-day in the English Church a position that is really higher because it is officially recognised and legally sanctioned; but no one thinks of the Primate as an English pope, and so far as we can see he is in no danger of becoming one.

of poverty can make a bishop higher or lower. But all are alike successors of the Apostles."[1]

When difficulties arose, they were settled by as many bishops as possible meeting together *in council.* Even in the 3rd century such synods were often of considerable size.[2]

By the 4th century, the triumph of the Church in the united Empire of Constantine made it possible for Christendom to express her unity in a *General* or ecumenical Council. The Seven General Councils, which have always been recognised by the Roman and the Eastern Churches alike, met between A.D. 325 and 787. None of them was held at Rome; over none did a Bishop of Rome preside; each was summoned by an Emperor.[3]

This expression in General Councils of the federal unity of Christendom was the very opposite of papalism. It was not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the united Bishops of all Christendom that the Church turned for authority and guidance.

[1] *Ep.* 146 *Ad Evangelum.* For complete information on this part of the subject see F. W. Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome* (London, Longmans).

[2] St. Cyprian assembled two synods at Carthage, A.D. 256, containing 71 and 87 bishops respectively. For further information see Dr. W. E. Collins, Bishop of Gibraltar, *The Authority of General Councils* (Church Historical Society).

[3] The Seven General Councils are:—1 Nicaea, 325; 2 Constantinople, 381; 3 Ephesus, 434; 4 Chalcedon (a suburb of Constantinople), 451; 5 Constantinople, 553; 6 Constantinople, 680; 7 Nicaea, 787. Thus four of the General Councils were held at Constantinople, and the other three at two neighbouring cities in Asia Minor, Nicaea and Ephesus.

To these representative Councils, to the first Six General Councils (A.D. 325 to 680) especially, we owe the common theology of Christendom; and it is a significant fact that the great Protestant Communions have been not less zealous than the rest of modern Christendom in proclaiming the main doctrines which are defined by these ecumenical Councils. The Church then in her federal liberty did succeed in realising a unity of faith so profound that the supremely difficult and crucial questions then decided have been regarded as settled ever since, by Easterns and Romans, Anglicans and Nonconformists alike. When we speak of 'orthodox' Christians we are speaking in fact of those who accept the theology of the first Six Councils.

Now these General Councils (in which the federated local Churches of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and the rest met together as parts of the One Catholic Church) were *really* representative. They not only issued decrees, but their decrees were accepted by the whole Church. Not until a Council had won this universal acceptance could it be counted as a General Council.[1] It is the Church, the whole Church, and nothing less

[1] The Council of Ariminium, though it was larger than any previous one, was never accepted, and its decrees are counted heretical; it is not therefore a General Council. The first Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), on the other hand, though only Eastern bishops were present at it, with none from Rome or any other Church of the West, was accepted by the whole Church, and has always been accounted a General Council by East and West alike.

than the whole Church that has given their authority to the ecumenical Councils.[1]

Thus, even after the position of the Bishop of Rome had reached a considerable degree of supremacy, we still have the federal system of the Church preserved. The Popes fought against this local independence in the West, meeting with varying degrees of resistance which culminated in the Reformation of the 16th Century.[2] But the Eastern Church has never lost the federal unity, which it has kept from the ages of primitive Christendom.

The Orthodox Churches of the East are self-governing local Churches, each under its own authorities. Yet they are in close federation: they have communion with each other, they hold the same articles of faith; they are in perfect unity together as parts of the Holy Orthodox Church of the East, which already has about 100,000,000 members, and, covering a far larger territory than that of the Roman Catholic countries, promises to be greatly more numerous, as the colonisation of Siberia proceeds, and as the smaller Churches recover from the persecution and isolation under which some of them were almost destroyed during the centuries of desolating Mohammedan tyranny.

[1] For the whole subject, and for references to authorities, see Bishop W. E. Collins, *The Authority of General Councils*, as above.

[2] I have tried to sketch the main points of this resistance in *Everyman's History of the English Church* (Mowbray, 1909). For fuller treatment see the standard works on English Church History, a list of which is there given.

"The Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Eastern Church," to use its official designation, consists of twelve particular or national Churches, the number being raised to thirteen by the inclusion of the Bulgarian Church. The Orthodox Eastern Churches thus are:—

1. The Patriarchate of Constantinople.
2. The Patriarchate of Alexandria.
3. The Patriarchate of Antioch.
4. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem.
5. The Church of Cyprus.
6. The Church of Mount Sinai.
7. The Greek Church.
8. The Servian Church.
9. The Rumanian Church.
10. The Church of Montenegro.
11. The Orthodox Church in Austria.
12. The Russian Church.

Intensely conservative as the Eastern Church is, she has thus maintained the federal principle of unity, unaltered from the earliest ages. Her method of federation is thus described by the Bishop of Gibraltar:—[1]

> "The Orthodox Eastern Church consists of twelve mutually independent Churches (or thirteen if we reckon the Bulgarian Church) using their own language in divine service (or some ancient form of it, as in Russia) and varying not a little in points of detail, but standing in full communion with one another, and united as equals in what has been described as one great ecclesiastical

[1] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 10th edition. "Orthodox Church," by Dr. W. E. Collins.

federation. However, in using such language it must be remembered that we are not dealing with bodies which were originally separated from one another and have now entered into fellowship, but with bodies who have grown naturally from a single origin and have not become estranged."

The same federal unity is enjoyed by the Anglican Church to-day.

There are at present ten Churches in the Anglican Communion, as follows:—

1. The English Church.
2. The Irish Church.
3. The Scottish Church.
4. The American Church.
5. The Canadian Church.
6. The Australian Church.
7. The Indian Church.
8. The South African Church.
9. The New Zealand Church.
10. The West Indian Church.

These consist of 216 dioceses, which (with the exception of the 7 Scottish dioceses) are grouped into 15 provinces. In addition there are 33 extra-provincial dioceses of a missionary character (including the six dioceses of the Japanese Church). Thus the total number of dioceses in 1908 was 249; but it has since increased.

It is interesting to notice that four of the Japanese dioceses are in connection with the English Church and two with the American: yet these six dioceses have such unity that

they hold general synods and pass canons, and form a budding National Church of Japan. The other mission dioceses will also no doubt eventually become national Churches with native ministries.

These local Churches possess each its rights of local independence, as do those of the Eastern Communion to-day, as did those of the earlier Christian centuries when the Church was undivided. Their local independence is thus described by Fr. Puller[1]:—

> "Each of these Churches has its own system of synods and its own code of canons. Each has the right to consecrate its own Bishops including its Metropolitan or Metropolitans, and, if it has one, its Primate; though each has also the right to request the Archbishop of Canterbury, or any other Primate or Metropolitan of our Communion, to undertake the office of chief consecrator in particular cases on its behalf. Each of these National Churches has its own judicial system, with courts of first instance and courts of appeal, or at any rate each Church has full power to create such a system. Each Church has an inherent right to authorise for its own use its own liturgical books; though it has also the right to pass self-denying ordinances binding its own hands either entirely or partially in regard to this matter. It can, however, recover its

[1] Pan-Anglican Papers: F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E., *The Anglican Communion: Its relation to its Parts* (F. 3D.) pp. 3, 4. London, S.P.C.K., 1908.

freedom, if it chooses to do so, by abrogating such ordinances. Each National Church has authority to send out Missions to non-Christians who live outside its borders; but in doing so it must take care not to disturb or interfere with Missions to non-Christians, sent out previously by other National Churches of its Communion, and of course it must not intrude unasked within the provincial or diocesan boundaries established by such Churches."

At the same time the particular Churches that enjoy such rights of self-government are, as everybody knows, in complete unity with each other: and together they form the Anglican Communion, the bishops and representatives of which come together from all parts of the world every ten years to meet in conference. Under the present arrangement this Lambeth Conference of Bishops is preceded by the Pan-Anglican Congress, in which laymen and laywomen take part, as well as priests and bishops.

Such federal unity is (when extended to the whole Church) the primitive and Catholic method of Church government, the only method that was ever accepted by the whole Church, East and West alike, the only system that has ever proved compatible with the unity of Christendom. It is also recognised by the modern world as the method of that enlightenment, liberty, and order which make up our civilisation.

For the universal understanding of this prin-

ciple we have to work; because through the federation of the Christian world, and through this alone, shall we recover the visible unity of the Catholic Church.

Other methods have been tried and have failed, the methods of Papal autocracy and of separatist anarchy. Great is the price that Christendom has paid for these failures. But will the wisdom of the Church Universal tolerate this miserable confusion in the future? Not surely if the inspiration of the Spirit of wisdom and understanding and peace be with her. Tragic as is the decline of the Papacy, it would yet seem to be inevitable and necessary; for not until that obstacle, the claim to "have Lordship"[1] is rolled away, can the spirit of schism disappear and the unity of the Church be revealed. May those members of the Roman Church, who are even now struggling for freedom, succeed in reducing her fatal autocracy, so that all that is true and good in the Roman Church may be saved from destruction, and she may rise up worthy of her great past, and free from the spirit of exclusiveness and schism.

Then the unity of the Church will be realised in union. Union is indeed the goal for which we long, and for which our Lord prayed.[2] As charity and wisdom grow, the way will open. Scholars are already agreeing as they never did before: there is a real commonwealth of learning, and party spirit is becoming a mark of the half-educated. The old battle-cries of Church

[1] Luke 22. 25. [2] John 17. 11, 22.

against Church grow fainter every day; the barriers are weaker, and gaps have already been made here and there. In the new world and in the missionary field there is already much co-operation: Anglicans have shared in the worship of the Eastern Church; they have been able also to co-operate in helpful ways with Non-conformists without any surrender of principle. There is more unity of belief, more Catholicity in faith and practice. The old negative Romanism is declining, and the old negative Protestantism is declining, but Catholicism is not; Catholic worship and the broad universality of the true Catholic temper are spreading everywhere.

It is not impossible to think already of intercommunion between some divided parts of Christendom; since, even as we are, we can draw together. No one, in this age when the Christian races are distributed all over the world, would deny the right of different peoples to join together for their own worship, as the Greeks and Russians do in England with the brotherly recognition and approval of the English Church. The Greek churches in London and in other towns are an object-lesson that, where there is no proselytism, where there is no denial of the one by the other, it is even now possible for different Churches to exist in the same place without schism.[1]

[1] In Eastern Christendom different patriarchates of the Orthodox Church are allowed to exist in the same place: while even the Roman Church has several small Uniat Churches in communion with itself, which retain their independent organisation, and whose jurisdictions "are in-

For schism is not a geographical accident, but a temper after all of the heart: when denial and proselytism are gone, schism itself is in a fair way to disappear. We shall never induce the various Churches of Christendom to arrange themselves within particular territories, since the modern world has broken away from territorial limitations; and indeed a National Church is not the Church of a particular territory, but of a particular race, because a nation is a people and not the land the people live on.[1]

It is not after all the existence of different Churches that makes disunion, but the refusal of the different Churches to have communion with each other. We cannot change the face of Christendom, but we may be able to change its heart.

Partisanship, narrowness, bitterness must be fought down as the very spirit of antichrist by each of us in his own soul; and when all the Churches of Christendom can unite in a General Confession, then perhaps we may be ready for a General Council.

Meanwhile, as the spirit of schism is purged

terlaced over the whole field of Oriental Christendom," as Mr. Lacey well says in his *Unity of the Church*, p. 143–4 (Church Historical Society), London, S.P.C.K., 1898.

[1] The ancient British and Scottish Churches were in this way Churches of the Britons and of the Scots, with their own distinct customs and peculiar methods of Church government, though they were in union with the then undivided Church. The Church of St. Patrick to which Britain owes so much was a national Church in this strict and accurate sense: it was the Church of a people. For the general principle as to National Churches from the pen of a great historian, see Bishop Creighton, *The Idea of a National Church*, (Church Historical Society).

away, it will be possible for the separated parts of Christendom gradually to draw together, no longer vainly attempting to destroy one another, no longer nursing the schismatic spirit, but frankly recognising and loving each other. With such a Christlike temper, working on the steady ground of modern learning, it should not be difficult for Christians to correct what is in error, to strengthen what is weak, and to forgive what is past.

For reunion Christendom is praying, with her Lord, and to reunion she will attain ; and the ways will open, and the walls will crumble away at the breath of prayer. Drawing nearer to the spirit of Christ, whose charity we have so dishonoured by our pinched and bitter thoughts, we shall attain to reunion as we become worthy of it,—as we grow up—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." [1]

There is indeed no earthly head given to the Church, but there is a Divine Head through whom we are one body ; and this unity of the Spirit we have to keep in the bond of peace. For there is one body, and one Spirit ; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all.

We are brethren. Why do we wrong one another ?

[1] Eph. 4. 13.

APPENDIX I

The Federal Principle

IN order not to confuse the simplicity of the issue, I have taken it for granted that the reader will use the word 'federal' in its ordinary sense, as we use it for instance of the German Empire, or of the Swiss Republic which also is one, and yet is organised in a number of Cantons, each administering its own affairs.

It is possible to use the word in a looser sense than this, as if it implied a separation between the federated bodies. At least the word has been so used in describing a wrong view of the Church, and therefore to some minds it may have such associations. But there is no other word that describes intelligibly the organisation of the Catholic Church before the Schism. Therefore we must use the word federal, and use it in its right sense, as describing the relation between the different parts of one body,—as, for instance, the British Empire is one body, and Britons are members of that one body.

I am therefore adding this Appendix to prevent a mere argument about words, and especially in view of those who have associated the word 'federal' with a separatist view of the Church. Such a view represents Christians

as at first consisting of individual believers, who for convenience united in local associations; it represents these 'Churches' as gradually growing in power and authority, and afterwards uniting in a confederation of societies which formed the Catholic Church.

Of that separatist theory Bishop Gore says:—

"Now this mode of conceiving the progress of Christianity is in direct violation of the evidence. Christ himself constituted the Church and gave it his authority, so that it came upon men as a divine gift, with a divine claim, through the apostolic preaching. From the beginning of Christianity it came to men and took them up, one by one, out of their isolation and alienation from God into its holy and blessed fellowship. It was never a creation of their own by free association. The idea is a figment."[1]

It is certain that the separatist theory here condemned is not that held by the Church Universal. Nor is it that of the Church of England. The definition of our Nineteenth Article of Religion is as much against this as it is against the 'invisible Church' theory:—

XIX. OF THE CHURCH

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

In the Homilies a further definition, in the language of the Reformation period, is given:—

"The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the founda-

[1] *The Church and the Ministry*, 4th ed., p. 50. (Longmans, 1899.)

tion of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith."[1]

The illustrious Hooker emphasised the unity of particular Churches in the one Catholic Church by the illustration of the sea:—

"As the main body of the sea being one, yet within divers precincts hath divers names, so the Catholic Church is in like sort divided into a number of distinct societies, every one of which is termed a Church within itself."[2]

So much for the separatist theory. It is possible also, however, to press the existence of 'Branches' of the Church in a wrong way, so as in fact to deny the Church's unity,—at least controversialists have sometimes accused Anglican writers of so doing, when our theologians have spoken of the Anglican Communion, the Roman, and the Eastern Communions, as Branches of the Church.

Mr. Lacey well describes this wrong view, sometimes attributed to us, of the 'Branch Theory.'[3]

"We are in some quarters seriously supposed to regard the Catholic Church as consisting essentially of a number of separate and independent communions. . . . From this it would follow that, so far as the whole Church is one, its

[1] *Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth.* (Oxford ed. 1802, p. 393). Book II, Homily 16 (Whitsunday), Part 2.

[2] Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book III, cap. 1, § 14.

[3] T. A. Lacey, *The Unity of the Church as treated by English Theologians*, pp. 22–5 (Church Historical Society).

unity is found only in the agglomeration of these parts, essentially independent, but bound together by a loose federal tie. So loose indeed is the tie, that it does not as a matter of fact involve so much as diplomatic intercourse between the members of the union. Indeed they might rather be regarded as so many separate kingdoms reigned over by one Divine and invisible Monarch."

This, as Mr. Lacey points out, is a travesty of the truth :—

"I do not believe that a passage could be adduced from any of our writers treating this kind of division as a thing good or even tolerable in itself."

The fact that the various Communions or Branches of Christendom are divided is an unhappy fact which we have to face, and cannot ignore. "We in no way imply that they ought to be so divided, still less that such divisions are a necessary or essential feature of the Church's constitution."

It is thus the absence of a belief in the Church's unity that is the fallacy in this theory which opponents sometimes credit us with. To mean this by Federation is to misuse the word ; for it is precisely the absence of federation that shows the disunion. One cannot of course properly use the word 'federal' at all for a tie that does not "involve so much as diplomatic intercourse." One cannot even use the word 'alliance.' Nay more, the breaking off of diplomatic relations between states is equivalent to a declaration of war.

This is the deplorable position in Christendom to-day. There is no federation between the different Branches or Communions of the

Church, nor even alliance. They are in fact separate. In so far indeed as these Communions exist, they form a partial effort towards unity: there is unity between the Churches of the Anglican Communion, there is unity between the Churches of the Eastern Communion; there is unity between the Churches of the Roman Communion; and this is better—far better—than if the Church of England were separated from her sister in America, or the Russian Church from the Greek, or the Church of France from that of Spain. But these Branches or Communions do not make the unity of the Church as a whole, since they are separated from each other.

Speaking of the word 'Communion,' Mr. Lacey proceeds:—

"We use the term, then, to express a certain unhappy fact; and we are careful not to extend its meaning beyond the precise limits of the fact. It is not these divers *Communions* that we regard as members or branches of the Catholic Church, but the local, provincial, or national Churches which are attached to one or other of them. The Church of France, the Church of Spain, are branches of the Universal Church." [1]

And he illustrates this by quoting the 30th English Canon of 1604, which speaks of our unhappy divisions in language of the most careful precision:—

CANON XXX

"So far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they

[1] *Ibid.* p. 24.

held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which doth neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders."

It is indeed the actual state of schism that renders confusion of thought possible. The Church is one; yet no one denies the existence of schism in the Church. Thus, though we cannot recognise division as a principle, we have to recognise it as a fact. The unity exists, but it is not realised in union. For this reason we welcome any drawing together of the Churches: even the renewal of diplomatic intercourse and of mutual courtesies is a considerable step forward. In other words, the weakest form of *alliance* would be an improvement on our present relations; the weakest form of federation would be a still greater improvement. And it seems to be certain that the reunion of Christendom will come through such a gradual strengthening of bonds. Separation will give place to alliance (as it does to some extent already in the mission field), and alliance will develop into federation.

Thus what are as a matter of fact—to our shame—very loose ties at the present day can be strengthened, and the underlying unity realised. Here again the analogy to political federalism is very clear. Professor Dicey points out that both the underlying unity and

the strengthening of loose bonds are necessary to a federation :—

"There must exist, in the first place, a body of countries such as the Cantons of Switzerland, the Colonies of America, or the Provinces of Canada, so closely connected by locality, by history, by race, or the like, as to be capable of bearing, in the eyes of their inhabitants, an impress of common nationality. It will, also, be generally found (if we appeal to experience) that lands which now form part of a federal state were at some stage of their existence bound together by close alliance or by subjection to a common sovereign. It were going further than facts warrant to assert that this earlier connection is essential to the formation of a federal state. But it is certain that where federalism flourishes it is in general the slowly-matured fruit of some earlier and looser connection." [1]

The second condition which Dr. Dicey lays down is that the States must desire union, but must desire also to maintain each its own limited independence. At the outset, he says, the citizens of one state, such as Lucerne, felt a keener loyalty to their own state or canton than to the whole commonwealth, just as unfortunately many Anglicans and nearly all Romans care more for their own Church than for Christendom: but it is remarkable how in these secular confederations the feeling of loyalty to the whole commonwealth has grown after federation has taken place. Can we doubt that in a similar way, as the particular Churches draw together, loyalty to the Church Catholic will grow?

A further question may be asked. Since the unit of the Catholic Church is strictly the

[1] A. V. Dicey, *The Law of the Constitution*, pp. 128–9. (London, Macmillan, 1886.)

diocese, and that dioceses are already federated together in the great Communions of Anglicanism, of Romanism, and of the East, can these Communions themselves be federated, can there be federations within a federation?

This question also we put only to avoid a confusion that does not exist in fact. We can hold the principle of federation irrespective of the bodies to be federated. The fact that dioceses all over the world are already federated into provinces, into national Churches, and into greater Communions,[1] only shows that the federal principle is now, as it has always been, at work in the Church. It does not prevent these Communions being themselves one day federated peaceably together in the realisation of Catholic unity.

Once more, a political analogy comes to help us and to show how unnecessary is any confusion of thought. The Dominion of Canada is just as much a federation as the United States of America—indeed its constitution is copied from that of the United States. Yet Canada as a whole state is itself federated with the rest of the British Empire. And within recent years South Africa and Australia have followed

[1] e.g. the French dioceses are grouped into provinces under the Archbishop of Paris and the other archbishops, these together form the French Church; and the French Church with the Churches of Italy, and the other Churches in Communion with Rome together form the Roman Communion. Similarly the English dioceses are grouped into the provinces of Canterbury and York: these together form the English Church; and the English Church, with the Churches of Scotland, Ireland, America, etc., in union with her, form the Anglican Communion.

her example and are now federated Dominions within the larger federation of the Empire.

We have said enough to show that one can correctly apply the word 'federal' to the Catholic constitution of the Church. It may now be worth while to quote from the same authority on constitutional law the three leading characteristics of federalism, in order that the reader may see that they are leading characteristics also of Catholicism :—

"From the notion that national unity can be reconciled with state independence by a division of powers under a common constitution between the nation on the one hand and the individual States on the other, flow the three leading characteristics of federalism—the supremacy of the constitution—the distribution among bodies with limited and co-ordinate authority of the different powers of government—the authority of the Courts to act as interpreters of the constitution." [1]

These characteristics marked the Catholic Church in the thousand years before the Schism. (1) *The supremacy of the constitution*, that is, of Holy Scripture ; (2) *the distribution among bodies with limited and co-ordinate authority*, that is, the dioceses and particular Churches, *of the different powers of government*, that is, the discipline of the Church ; (3) *the authority of the Courts*, that is, of the General Councils, to act as *interpreters of the constitution*, that is, of Holy Scripture.

It cannot then be denied that the word federal may be correctly applied to the constitution of the Church before the Schism.

[1] A. V. Dicey, *The Law of the Constitution*, p. 132. (London, Macmillan, 1886.)

We have shown in this Appendix that a wrong idea of federalism is possible, that it may be pushed in the direction of separatism. We have shown in the chapters preceding that there is also a wrong idea of union, which may be pushed so as to mean papalism, and thus indeed to bring about the very evil of separatism. The remedy for both these errors is the old and simple one—to hold fast the two sides of the truth, and thus to prevent either developing into a lie. If mankind has learnt anything, it is that liberty must be combined with authority, and that the road to union lies through freedom and self-government.

Certainly we cannot emphasise too much the unity of the Church; and it is because we believe in unity, and hope for union, that we cannot acquiesce in autocracy continuing to prevent that union which freedom alone can restore.

The unity of the Church is the great fundamental fact. The Church was not made one by the federation of bodies once separate; she began by being one, and within her unity the particular Churches were federated because they were but parts of the One Church. In spite of the breaking of those federal bonds by schism, her unity remains.

By the federal unity of the Church, then, we mean that system which existed before the Schism, and no other; and in so far as modern political systems fall short of that spiritual unity, the analogy from them falls short also, useful though it is in helping

us to realise how compatible freedom is with fellowship, and how strong a safeguard is the liberty of the parts against the disruption of the whole,—against disloyalty, revolution, and separation.

APPENDIX II

The Lambeth Conference of 1908, on Reunion

(From *Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion. Holden at Lambeth Palace, July 27 to August 5, 1908. Encyclical Letter from the Bishops, with the Resolutions and Reports.* London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Northumberland Avenue, W.C., 1908.)

Two hundred and forty-two bishops were present.

I

EXTRACT FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S ENCYCLICAL LETTER

THERE is no subject of more general or more vivid interest than that of Reunion and Intercommunion. This interest indeed is not new. The peculiar position of our Communion, with its power and hope of mediating in a divided Christendom, has long been recognised by members of our own Churches and by others. This position is to us a continual call to service, as was abundantly acknowledged by the Conferences of 1888 and 1897. But this year's Conference has met in circumstances which pressed upon us this same call to service with a new insistence. The winning of the nations to Christ, in fulfilment of His own great commission to His Church, is a matter of much more general concern to Christian people than ever before, and we realise the imperative necessity for effective and visible co-operation among the workers. The waste of force in the Mission field calls aloud for unity. Nor is this less necessary for the effective conduct of the war against the mighty forces of evil in Christian lands. With the realisation of this need has come a new

demand for unity, a penitent acknowledgment of the faults that hinder it, and a quickened eagerness in prayer that, through the mercy of God, it may be attained.

The careful Report of our Committee and the detailed Resolutions may seem to some but cold in comparison with the warmth of the desires of many hearts. But these readers should remember the grave responsibility which attaches to the composition of such documents, and the necessity of accuracy, candour, and self-restraint, if the cause of unity is to be advanced by them.

Such Resolutions and Reports cannot be summarised; they must be studied. It will be observed that, in regard to every one of the Churches or groups of Churches to which our attention has been directed, we have tried to indicate some lines of definite practical approach. Wherever we have had reason to think that such an advance would be welcomed, we have gone far to meet our brethren. Where we have felt it absolutely necessary to sound a note of warning, we have tried to speak the truth in love.

Our Resolutions represent, for the most part, the present situation of our public relations with Churches more or less widely separated from us. They may seem to show the remoteness rather than the nearness of corporate reunion. But before that consummation can be reached there must come a period of preparation. This preparation must be made by individuals in many ways, by co-operation in moral and social endeavour and in promoting the spiritual interests of mankind, by brotherly intercourse, by becoming familiar with one another's characteristic beliefs and practices, by the increase of mutual understanding and appreciation. All this will be fruitful in proportion as it is dominated by a right ideal of reunion. We must set before us the Church of Christ as He would have it, one spirit and one body, enriched with all those elements of divine truth which the separated communities of Christians now emphasise severally, strengthened by the interaction of all the gifts and graces which our divisions now hold asunder, filled with all the fulness of God. We dare not, in the name of peace, barter away those precious things of which we have been made stewards. Neither can we wish others to be unfaithful to trusts which they hold no less sacred. We must fix our eyes on the

Church of the future, which is to be adorned with all the precious things, both theirs and ours. We must constantly desire not compromise but comprehension, not uniformity but unity.[1]

II

THE RESOLUTIONS ON REUNION AND INTERCOMMUNION FORMALLY ADOPTED BY THE WHOLE CONFERENCE

This Conference reaffirms the resolution of the Conference of 1897 that "Every opportunity should be taken to emphasise the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation." It desires further to affirm that in all partial projects of reunion and intercommunion the final attainment of the divine purpose should be kept in view as our object; and that care should be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it.

The Conference recognises with thankfulness the manifold signs of the increase of the desire for unity among all Christian bodies; and with a deep sense of the call to follow the manifest guiding of the Holy Spirit, solemnly urges the duty of special intercession for the unity of the Church, in accordance with our Lord's own prayer.

This Conference resolves that a letter of greeting be sent from the Lambeth Conference to the National Council of the Russian Church about to assemble, and that the letter should be conveyed to the Council by two or more bishops if possible; and that His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to cause such a letter to be written, and to sign it on behalf of the Conference, and to nominate bishops to convey it to the Council.

The Conference respectfully requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee to take cognisance of all that concerns our relations with the Churches of the Orthodox East, and desires that this Committee should be on a permanent basis.

The Conference is of opinion that it should be the recog-

[1] Resolutions 58–78.

nised practice of the Churches of our Communion (1) at all times to baptize the children of members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion in cases of emergency, provided that there is a clear understanding that baptism should not be again administered to those so baptized; (2) at all times to admit members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion to communicate in our churches, when they are deprived of the ministrations of a priest of their own Communion, provided that (*a*) they are at that time admissible to Communion in their own churches, and (*b*) are not under any disqualification so far as our own rules of discipline are concerned.

The Conference would welcome any steps that might be taken to ascertain the precise doctrinal position of the ancient separate Churches of the East with a view to possible intercommunion, and would suggest to the Archbishop of Canterbury the appointment of Commissions to examine the doctrinal position of particular Churches, and (for example) to prepare some carefully framed statement of the Faith as to our Lord's Person, in the simplest possible terms, which should be submitted to each of such Churches, where feasible, in order to ascertain whether it represents their belief with substantial accuracy. The conclusions of such Commissions should in our opinion be submitted to the Metropolitans or Presiding Bishops of all the Churches of the Anglican Communion.

In the event of doctrinal agreement being reached with such separate Churches, the Conference is of opinion that it would be right (1) for any Church of the Anglican Communion to admit individual communicant members of those Churches to communicate with us when they are deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and conversely, for our communicants to seek the same privileges in similar circumstances; (2) for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to permit our communicants to communicate on special occasions with these Churches, even when not deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and conversely, that their communicants should be allowed the same privileges in similar circumstances.

We consider that any more formal and complete compact between us and any such Church, seeing that it might affect

our relations with certain other Churches, should not take place without previous communication with any other Church which might be affected thereby.

The Conference is of opinion that it is of the greatest importance that our representatives abroad, both clerical and lay, whilst holding firmly to our own position, should show all Christian courtesy towards the Churches of the lands in which they reside and towards their ecclesiastical authorities; and that the chaplains to be selected for work on the continent of Europe and elsewhere should be instructed to show such courtesy.

We desire earnestly to warn members of our Communion against contracting marriages with Roman Catholics under the conditions imposed by modern Roman canon law, especially as these conditions involve the performance of the marriage ceremony without any prayer or invocation of the divine blessing, and also a promise to have their children brought up in a religious system which they cannot themselves accept.

The Conference desires to maintain and strengthen the friendly relations which already exist between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the ancient Church of Holland and the Old Catholic Churches, especially in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria.

With a view to the avoidance of further ecclesiastical confusion, the Conference would earnestly deprecate the setting up of a new organised body in regions where a Church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine offers religious privileges without the imposition of uncatholic terms of communion, more especially in cases where no difference of language or nationality exists; and in view of the friendly relations referred to in the previous Resolution, it would respectfully request the Archbishop of Canterbury, if he thinks fit, to bring this Resolution to the notice of the Old Catholic Bishops.

For the sake of unity, and as a particular expression of brotherly affection, we recommend that any official request of the *Unitas Fratrum* for the participation of Anglican Bishops in the consecration of Bishops of the *Unitas* should be accepted, provided that

(1) Such Anglican Bishops should be not less than three in

number, and should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Consecration and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishops belong;

(ii) The Synods of the *Unitas* (*a*) are able to give sufficient assurance of doctrinal agreement with ourselves in all essentials (as we believe that they will be willing and able to do); and (*b*) are willing to explain its position as that of a religious community or missionary body in close alliance with the Anglican Communion; and (*c*) are willing to accord a due recognition to the position of our Bishops within Anglican dioceses and jurisdictions; and (*d*) are willing to adopt a rule as to the administration of Confirmation more akin to our own.

After the conditions prescribed in the preceding Resolution have been complied with, and a Bishop has been consecrated in accordance with them, corresponding invitations from any Bishop of the *Unitas Fratrum* to an Anglican Bishop and his Presbyters to participate in the ordination of a Moravian Presbyter should be accepted, provided that the Anglican Bishop should participate both in the saying of the prayers of ordination and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishop belongs.

Any Bishop or Presbyter so consecrated or ordained should be free to minister in the Anglican Communion with due episcopal licence; and, in the event of the above proposals—i.e. Resolutions 1 and 2—being accepted and acted upon by the Synods of the *Unitas*, during the period of transition some permission to preach in our churches might on special occasions be extended to Moravian Ministers by Bishops of our Communion.

We recommend that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to name a committee to communicate, as need arises, with representatives of the *Unitas*, and also to direct that the decisions of the present Conference be communicated to the *Secretarius Unitatis*.

This Conference heartily thanks the Archbishop of Upsala

for his letter of friendly greeting, and for sending his honoured colleague, the Bishop of Kalmar, to confer with its members on the question of the establishment of an alliance of some sort between the Swedish and Anglican Churches. The Conference respectfully desires the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Commission to correspond further with the Swedish Church through the Archbishop of Upsala on the possibility and conditions of such an alliance.

The Conference receives with thankfulness and hope the Report of its Committee on Reunion and Intercommunion, and is of opinion that, in the welcome event of any project of reunion between any Church of the Anglican Communion and any Presbyterian or other non-episcopal Church, which, while preserving the Faith in its integrity and purity, has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation, it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610. Further, in the opinion of the Conference, it might be possible to authorise arrangements (for the period of transition towards full union on the basis of episcopal ordination) which would respect the convictions of those who had not received episcopal Orders, without involving any surrender on our part of the principle of Church order laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer.

Every opportunity should be welcomed of co-operation between members of different Communions in all matters pertaining to the social and moral welfare of the people.

The members of the Anglican Communion should take pains to study the doctrines and position of those who are separated from it and to promote a cordial mutual understanding; and, as a means towards this end, the Conference suggests that private meetings of ministers and laymen of different Christian bodies for common study, discussion, and prayer should be frequently held in convenient centres.

The constituted authorities of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion should, as opportunity offers, arrange conferences with representatives of other Christian Churches, and meetings for common acknowledgment of the sins of division, and for intercession for the growth of unity.

III

THE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REUNION AND INTERCOMMUNION[1]

PREAMBLE

I. THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH.
II. THE SEPARATE CHURCHES OF THE EAST.
III. THE LATIN COMMUNION.
IV. SEPARATE CHURCHES OF THE WEST.
V. THE *UNITAS FRATRUM*.
VI. THE SCANDINAVIAN CHURCHES.
VII. PRESBYTERIAN & OTHER NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.
APPENDIX OF EXTRACTS ON THE PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINE OF ORDINATION.

YOUR Committee appointed to consider and report upon the subject of Reunion and Intercommunion with Episcopal and Non-episcopal Churches and to review the report of

[1] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop (R. Ellis) of Aberdeen.
Bishop (W. C. Doane) of Albany.
Bishop (M. R. Neligan) of Auckland.
Bishop (G. W. Kennion) of Bath and Wells.
Bishop (C. Gore) of Birmingham.
Bishop (E. J. Palmer) of Bombay.
Bishop (W. J. F. Robberds) of Brechin (Primus).
Archbishop (St. C. G. A. Donaldson) of Brisbane.
Bishop (F. Goldsmith) of Bunbury.
Bishop (E. Talbot) of Central Pennsylvania.
Bishop (C. P. Anderson) of Chicago.
Bishop (C. S. Olmsted) of Colorado.
Bishop (J. B. Crozier) of Down and Connor (*Secretary*).
Bishop (H. C. G. Moule) of Durham.
Bishop (A. Robertson) of Exeter.
Bishop (J. A. Richardson) of Fredericton (*Secretary*).
Bishop (W. E. Collins) of Gibraltar.
Bishop (A. E. Campbell) of Glasgow.
Bishop (H. E. Cooper) of Grafton and Armidale.
Bishop (L. H. Roots) of Hankow.
Bishop (D. Williams) of Huron.
Bishop (J. M. Francis) of Indianapolis.
Bishop Coadjutor (A. E. Joscelyne) of Jamaica.
Bishop (G. F. P. Blyth) in Jerusalem.
Bishop (G. A. Lefroy) of Lahore.
Bishop (E. King) of Lincoln.
Bishop (J. H. Johnson) of Los Angeles.

a Committee appointed to consider the position of the *Unitas Fratrum*, have approached their important task as follows:—

They have divided themselves into groups dealing with the different aspects of the subject submitted to their consideration. They have also referred certain special questions to another group selected from their whole membership.

The Report and Resolutions which they now have the honour to present are based upon material furnished by the groups severally, but they represent the judgment of the Committee as a whole.

At the head of their Report they desire to affirm once again the principle asserted by the Conference of 1897 (Res. 34), that "the Divine purpose of visible unity among Chris-

Bishop (G. L. King) of Madagascar.
Bishop (G. M. Williams) of Marquette.
Archbishop (H. L. Clarke) of Melbourne.
Bishop (J. Carmichael) of Montreal.
Bishop (A. J. Maclean) of Moray and Ross.
Bishop (C. O. Mules) of Nelson.
Bishop (N. D. J. Straton) of Newcastle.
Bishop (D. H. Greer) of New York.
Bishop Coadjutor (E. M. Parker) of New Hampshire.
Bishop (C. P. Scott) of North China.
Bishop (C. F. D'Arcy) of Ossory.
Bishop (C. Hamilton) of Ottawa.
Bishop (C. O. L. Riley) of Perth.
Bishop (C. Whitehead), of Pittsburgh.
Archbishop (S. B. Matheson) of Rupertsland.
Bishop (A. G. Edwards) of St. Asaph.
Bishop (J. W. Williams) of St. John's, Kaffraria.
Bishop (J. Wordsworth) of Salisbury (*Chairman*).
Bishop (L. L. Kinsolving) of Southern Brazil.
Bishop (W. C. Gray) of Southern Florida.
Bishop (E. S. Talbot) of Southwark.
Bishop (C. G. Lang) of Stepney (*Secretary*).
Bishop (T. F. Gailor) of Tennessee.
Bishop (C. H. Gill) of Travancore.
Bishop (A. C. A. Hall) of Vermont.
Bishop (T. H. Armstrong) of Wangaratta.
Bishop (W. W. Cassells) of Western China.
Archbishop (E. Nuttall) of the West Indies.
Bishop T. E. Wilkinson.
Bishop (H. E. Ryle) of Winchester.

tians" is "a fact of revelation." Your Committee draw from this principle the inference that in all partial projects of reunion and intercommunion the final attainment of the Divine purpose should be kept in view as our object; and that care should be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it. They have thought it right to propose a resolution to the Conference on this point. They recognise with thankfulness the manifold signs of an increasing desire for unity among all Christian bodies, and with a deepened sense of the call to co-operate with the manifest leading of the Divine Spirit they venture to request the Conference to renew the Resolution carried in 1897 (Res. 35), urging the duty of special intercession for the unity of the Church in accordance with our Lord's own prayer.

Your Committee do not, however, forget that we shall best enter into the Divine purpose by considering what sort of projects are opportune, and what should be deferred. They perceive that the final result may often be hindered by premature advances in one direction, and hastened by mature advances in another. In particular they believe that the most pressing need of the present day is advance in the direction of what is usually in England called Home Reunion. They are of opinion that success in this effort, if animated by spiritual motives and conducted upon Catholic lines, would be the most persuasive evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit of unity amongst us, and would be a most powerful instrument for promoting advances in quite different directions, and not in any way a hindrance to them. Next to this they believe that development of friendly relations already existing with the orthodox and separate Churches of the East, with the Old Catholics, with the Churches of Scandinavia, especially that of Sweden, and with the "Unitas Fratrum," will be most fruitful of results, and they have prepared resolutions in respect to all of these bodies. The Committee are not unmindful of the fact that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. But they realise that any advance in

this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created, and which we cannot of ourselves remove.

I

THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH

As regards our relations with the Churches of the Orthodox East, your Committee record with thankfulness the fact that there has been a steady growth of friendly intercourse between the two Communions during the period which has passed since the last Lambeth Conference. It will be enough to mention, in illustration of this fact, the healthy mediating influence of the Anglican bishopric at Jerusalem, the sending of students from the Orthodox East to the University of Oxford and of an English student to the Theological College of the Church of Constantinople in the island of Halki, the increasing number of voluntary societies in England and America which are working for the furtherance of intercommunion with the East, the many friendly visits which have been paid by English and American bishops to dignitaries of the Greek and Russian Churches, and the unvarying courtesy and goodwill with which they have been received; above all, the frequent occasions on which the clergy of our Churches in many lands have been able to minister to Orthodox Easterns in cases of emergency, and conversely. Whilst they have no desire to over-estimate the effect or the immediate value of things such as these, they are confident that such interchange of friendly offices cannot but have a real effect as time goes on.

Your Committee are of opinion that efforts after unity are in no sense furthered by a whittling away of our distinctive position, and hold that whilst we should always be ready to answer the questions of others as to our own position, we are bound to seek a like satisfaction at their hands. Nevertheless, they would lay stress upon the futility of putting definite questions on crucial points of ecclesiastical order to individual dignitaries of the Eastern Churches, which they can only answer in accordance with their existing canons. They are strongly of opinion that the more satisfactory way is to seize every opportunity of mutual service, in the sure conviction

that obstacles which now appear insurmountable may in course of time be found to vanish away. The doubts which have been expressed in the Greek Churches with regard to Baptism as ministered by us have already been laid to rest in the sister Church of Russia, where the question has been investigated and dealt with in the light of acknowledged facts. We venture to hope that the use which is already being made, in exceptional circumstances, of the services of our Ministry may increase and spread until it shall lead to the diffusion of a more accurate knowledge, and so put an end to the last remaining doubts on their part on the subject of the validity of our Orders.

Your Committee would call attention to Resolution 36 of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, which ran as follows :—

> "That the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London be requested to act as a Committee, with power to add to their number, to confer personally or by correspondence with the Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, the 'Holy Governing Synod' of the Church of Russia, and the chief authorities of the various Eastern Churches, with a view to consider the possibility of securing a clearer understanding and of closer relations between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion." . . .

They are of opinion that a Committee of this character should be constituted and made permanent, and that it might well take cognisance of all that concerns our relations with the Churches of the Orthodox East. Further, they would lay stress on the fact that all communications which concern the whole Orthodox Eastern Communion, in order to be effective, must be made to the authorities of that Communion conjointly, and not to individuals only.

With a view to a fuller and more effective comity between them and us, your Committee are of opinion that it should be the recognised practice of the Churches of our Communion

(1) at all times to baptize the children of members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion in cases of emergency, provided that there is a clear understanding that such baptism is under no circumstances to be repeated ;

(2) at all times to admit properly qualified communicant

members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion to communicate in our Churches when they are deprived of the ministrations of a priest of their own Communion.

Your Committee are also of opinion that in cases where there are large numbers of Orthodox Easterns dwelling amongst our people and without spiritual ministrations of their own, as in many parts of Canada and of the United States of America, the Bishops more especially concerned might be advised to communicate with the Patriarchs or Governing Bodies of the Churches concerned, informing them of the facts and saying that, in the event of a priest (or priests) being sent to minister to such Orthodox Easterns, both the Bishop and his clergy would be glad to extend to him (or them) all possible help and sympathy.

Further, in view of the fact that a National Council of the Russian Church is about to assemble, for the first time for over two hundred years, your Committee are of opinion that it is desirable that a letter of greeting should be sent from the Lambeth Conference to this Council, and that the letter should be conveyed to the Council by two or three bishops if possible; and that His Grace the President should be requested to cause such a letter to be written and to sign it on behalf of the Conference, and to nominate bishops to convey it to the Council.

II

THE SEPARATE CHURCHES OF THE EAST

Your Committee have taken into consideration the condition of the ancient separate Churches of the East, and desire to reaffirm their conviction that our position in the East involves real obligations in regard to the Churches which, whatever their shortcomings, have at least stood alone in the maintenance of our Holy Faith in many lands; and this under much obloquy and amid many persecutions. Nor, in spite of the fact that they have all rested under the imputation of heresy at one time or another, can they simply be thrown aside together on this ground. The Armenian Church, now scattered far and wide with the ancient nation of whose history it is the most striking and significant part, declares

with justice that its absence from the Council of Chalcedon was due to political reasons more than anything else, and has always strenuously denied, and apparently with no little reason, the charges of Aphthartodocetic heresy which have been levelled against it. The doctrinal position of the little East Syrian Church which was once implicated in Nestorianism seems to call for fresh consideration in our day; whilst modern investigations necessitate a re-examination of the relation in which Nestorius himself stood to the heresy which bears his name. It has been contended that the Monophysite heresy has no longer any real hold amongst the Syrian Jacobites, and that it is even less vigorous in the Coptic Church. Similar statements have been made with regard to the Syrian Churches in Southern India. How far these estimates are true is of course matter for careful study: in themselves they are undoubtedly probable, for it is the nature of heresy to die away, even as it is the nature of the Faith to grow and spread. But at least it is clear that the matter calls for investigation, and that these struggling Christian Churches, each and all of which have often turned towards us for help, have a real claim upon our love and our sympathy.

In view of these facts, your Committee are of opinion that steps should be taken to ascertain the doctrinal position of the separate Churches of the East, with a view to possible intercommunion; and that this could best be done by the appointment of commissions to examine the doctrinal position of each of them, and, for example, to suggest some carefully and sympathetically framed statement of the Faith as to our Lord's Person, in the simplest possible terms, which might be submitted to the particular Church, when feasible, in order to ascertain whether it represented the belief of that Church with substantial accuracy. And they are of opinion that, in the event of such doctrinal agreement being obtained, it would be right (1) for any Church of the Anglican Communion to admit individual communicant members of those Churches to communicate with us when they are deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and conversely, for our communicants to seek the same privileges in similar circumstances; and (2) for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to permit our communicants to communicate on

special occasions with these Churches, even when not deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and conversely, that their communicants should be allowed the same privileges in similar circumstances. Further than this, however, your Committee do not think it would be right to go, without taking into account the effect which such action might have upon our relations with other Churches.

III

THE LATIN COMMUNION

Turning now to the Latin Communion, your Committee record with deep interest certain more or lest marked changes in the relation between the Latin Church and the Christian world in general. (1) They notice the freer entrance of Roman Catholic theologians into the general field of modern scholarship, and they cannot but believe that a commonwealth of learning is a great help towards union; (2) they notice the tendency of many who are not of the Roman Catholic Communion, or, indeed, in many cases, members of any episcopal Church, to look with sympathetic hope towards that great Communion as embodying ideals which they find to be largely lacking in much of the sectional Christianity of to-day, and this all the more when they see a new spirit of intellectual liberty and ecclesiastical and social reform stirring within its borders; (3) at the same time they perceive in the current literature of the Roman Catholic Church a growing interest in the practical concerns of other Churches, and not least of our own, which is sometimes accompanied with a sense of deficiencies in the Latin Church itself for which a remedy will have to be sought outside.

These indications brighten the outlook for the future, but for the present your Committee can only repeat the opinion which has been expressed with deep regret in two former Conferences; viz. that under present circumstances it is useless to consider the question of possible intercommunion with our brethren of that Communion in view of the fact that no such proposal would be entertained but on conditions which it would be impossible for us to accept. Nevertheless they desire to place upon record their conviction that no projects

of union can ever be regarded as satisfactory which deliberately leave out the Churches of the Latin Communion; and nowhere more than here would they urge the importance of the cultivation of relations of friendly courtesy on the part of our representatives abroad towards the ecclesiastical authorities in the countries where they live, and the desirability that all chaplains chosen for service on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere should be instructed to show this courtesy.

At the same time your Committee feel it necessary to sound a note of warning in a matter which closely concerns our people abroad and at home, that of mixed marriages. Of the newest Roman Catholic regulations on the subject, according to which no marriage, and therefore no mixed marriage, is recognised as valid unless it has been contracted in the presence of the Roman Catholic parish priest or his representative, nor any betrothal as valid unless it has been entered into in the presence of a priest or of two witnesses, your Committee need not here speak further than to say that such regulations constitute a fruitful means of intimidation or evasion on the part of unconscientious persons, and may easily lead to grievous moral disorders in the case of the ignorant. Further, your Committee earnestly deplore any celebration of a marriage which is not either accompanied or immediately followed by prayer and the invocation of the divine sanction and blessing, and they would urge that our people should be warned that, in the case of a mixed marriage with a Roman Catholic, not only does the canon law of that Communion provide that it shall be thus celebrated, but there is commonly exacted a promise that the children of the marriage shall be brought up as Roman Catholics—that is to say, in a religious system which the Anglican parent cannot conscientiously accept.

IV

SEPARATE CHURCHES OF THE WEST

Your Committee desire to repeat the expressions of hearty goodwill and fraternal sympathy which have been made by former Conferences towards the ancient Church of Holland and the Old Catholics of Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. They have watched with much satisfaction and thankfulness

the progress of these latter bodies, which have for some time invited us to Holy Communion, and to which the Churches of our communion have formally extended the same privileges by resolutions of two Lambeth Conferences. They would like to see a similar relation of fellowship formally ratified between ourselves and the ancient Church of Holland. At the same time they cannot but deprecate very earnestly the setting up of new organised bodies of Christians in regions of America, England, or elsewhere, where a Church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine offers all religious privileges without the imposition of uncatholic terms of communion, more especially in cases where no difference of language or nationality exists.

With regard to the Spanish Reformed Church and the Lusitanian Church towards which previous Conferences have expressed their sympathy, both of which look to bishops of the Irish Church for counsel and support, your Committee desire to say that they welcome the successful efforts which have been made by each of these bodies to bring its liturgy into closer accord with Catholic standards.

V

THE *UNITAS FRATRUM*

This subject comes before the Conference as one previously discussed in 1878 and 1888, when the matter was left in suspense, and more recently in a detailed statement on the part of the *Unitas* (1904) regarding their succession and other questions, a statement framed expressly as an appeal to attention on the part of our Communion.

In 1906 the Archbishop of Canterbury appointed a Committee of Anglican Divines to review the problem. In their recent learned Report laid before the present Conference they find the claimed episcopal succession not proven.

On the other hand, the claim of the *Unitas* to respectful and sympathetic consideration is in many ways unique, in view not only of its reverence for Episcopacy, and of its cordial attitude towards our Communion, but of its noble record of missionary service.

The present moment is timely for the consideration of the

question, as the annual Synod of the British province of the *Unitas* meets next month (August 4, 1908), and the decennial General Synod meets at Herrnhut next year, 1909.

Members of your Committee have had the opportunity of meeting Bishop Hassé, President of the Directing Board of the Moravian Church in Great Britain, who was present by invitation; and a free interchange of inquiry and answer took place.

Though personally challenging the conclusions of the Committee of Divines, the Bishop frankly accepted the position created by it for our side. His impressions as to the attitude of his Church as a whole towards closer relations with us were decidedly favourable.

As a result of this interview and of subsequent discussions, four Resolutions are proposed by your Committee for acceptance by the Conference.

VI

THE SCANDINAVIAN CHURCHES

The Churches of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway are Churches of maritime and adventurous peoples which have much affinity with our own people. They have been brought into intimate contact with the natives of the British Isles at many periods of History, and they have contributed largely to the formation of our race. They have recently become bound by fresh ties to the British Empire, and they are sending forth emigrants into many parts of the United States of America and other countries of the world in which they come in contact with the Church life of our Communion. In their own homes these peoples have National Churches in close alliance with the State, which, though in different degrees, have preserved more of a continuity with the past than other Protestant and Reformed Churches on the continent of Europe.

Your Committee believe that it will be best in the first instance to refer to our relations with the Church of Sweden. They rejoice to observe that the Resolutions of our previous Conferences (Res. 14 of 1888 and Res. 39 of 1897) have been followed by the official mission of the Rt. Rev. H. W. Tottie, D.D., Bishop of Kalmar, who is the bearer of a

Latin letter to our President from the Archbishop of Upsala, dated June 20, 1908, in which the following sentence occurs: "Lætamur quod Vos, Episcopi Anglicani, jam pridem spectatis, ut Ecclesiam vestram et nostram inter se societate quadam devinciatis. Id quibus in rebus et quo modo fieri possit, deliberetis velim, cum Henry William Tottie, episcopo Calmariensi, collega meo carissimo, qui, Vobis benigne permittentibus atque jussu Regis nostri clementissimi, ad concilium quod mox habebitis, venturus est," which we may render: "We rejoice that you Anglican Bishops have for some time had in view the binding together of your Church and ours in some sort of alliance. I would ask that you should deliberate as to the points and the method of such an alliance with Henry William Tottie, Bishop of Kalmar, my beloved colleague, who, with your kind permission and under the orders of our most gracious King, is about to come to the Council which you are soon to hold."

Your Committee have taken full advantage of the presence of this honourable and learned envoy of the Swedish Church, and desire to thank him for the courtesy, kindness, and patience with which he has discharged his task towards themselves. They would suggest that before the Conference dissolves he should be invited to deliver this letter in person, and to receive the answer which is contained in the Resolution they have drafted.

The Bishop of Kalmar produced further evidence in support of what may now, perhaps, be described as the received opinion, that the actual succession of the Swedish Episcopate is unbroken. It appears from documents, to which he has drawn our attention, that importance was attached to the historic Episcopate at different periods in the history of the Church of Sweden.[1] He has translated the various forms of

[1] The Bishop of Kalmar refers to the *Kyrko-Ordning* of 1571, which contains the ritual of the consecration of Bishops and of the Ordering of Priests. On p. lxxxv of this book it is said, regarding the commission of a Bishop to ordain Priests: "This practice was very useful, and undoubtedly has proceeded from God the Holy Ghost." In the *Church Law* of 1686 (chapter xix. sec. 6), which is a book of present authority, it is said that whosoever should venture to minister as a Priest, and is not regularly called or ordained according to the rite there set forth, shall be punished by the Consistorial

consecration and ordination used in it at different times, distinguishing them from the forms of admission to a benefice, with a view to showing that they have been from the first sufficient. With regard to the Form for the Episcopate, the evidence which has been produced is such as to command very serious attention.[1] As regards the transmission of the presbyterate, the use in the ordination of presbyters of the term *Prediko-ämbetet* (ministerium), which appears to have

Court. At present an offence of this kind would be tried, under modern legislation, in a civil court.

[1] The form used in the consecration of a Bishop is to be found in the service entitled *How a Bishop shall be constituted* (inställas) *in Office* (chap. xii. of the *Handbok* of 1894). In the course of this service certain important texts of Scripture are read to the Bishop "who is to be consecrated" (som skall invigas). The Archbishop says: "The Lord grant unto thee grace to keep faithfully these words in thy heart! May they abide a rule for thy life . . . so as to sanctify thee for the care of that See which has been committed to thy trust. Of thee does the Church of God expect that thou shouldest consider the weightiness of the office of a Bishop," &c. Then, after a confession of faith, made in the form of the Apostles' Creed, follows examination as to willingness to undertake the office of a Bishop, carefulness therein and as to the preaching of God's Word and the administration of the Holy Sacraments, and care for the congregation (i.e. Church). Then follows the important formula: "God Almighty strengthen and help thee to keep these promises! And according to the authority which on God's behalf is entrusted to me by His congregation (i.e. Church) for this purpose, I hereby commit to thee the office of a Bishop in N. N. diocese, in the name of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Then the Bishop falls on his knees, and hymn 132 of the *Psalmbok* ("O thou Holy Ghost, come within us") is sung, during which the Archbishop delivers to him the King's Mandate and the Bishop's Cross. Then the assistants place on him his Cope, after which the Archbishop delivers to him his Staff. When the singing is ended the Archbishop and the assistants lay their hands upon the Bishop's head, and the Archbishop prays, "Our Father, &c., for ever and ever. Amen"—which is used here as a general prayer with special intention. Then the Bishop's Mitre is put on, and the Archbishop says a prayer very like our "Almighty God and most merciful Father" (said with us between the hymn and the formula "Receive the Holy Ghost"). The service closes with a Benediction.

been introduced into the form in 1686, is open to very grave objection; but the term *Prest-ämbetet* (priestly office), which was used in previous ordinals, has been restored since the year 1894. The Bishop of Kalmar has also translated for the use of those members of your Committee who have dealt with this subject the *Ritual of the Holy Supper* and the *Order of Confirmation*, and has called their attention to the fact that the three Creeds are accepted as standards by the Church of Sweden, though only the Apostles' Creed is used in public worship.

In view of all this, your Committee are of opinion that the question of the spiritual validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of Sweden is undoubtedly matter for friendly conference and explanation, and that certain lesser points should also be considered, e.g. as to the form in which the Diaconate is retained, and as to the rite and minister of Confirmation.

It is also very desirable, from an administrative point of view, that there should be some regular episcopal oversight over the exceedingly large bodies of Swedish settlers in the United States of America.[1]

Your Committee note with pleasure that a kind letter of greeting was also sent to our President by Bishop Skat Rørdam, Primate of Denmark, and they express an earnest hope that the friendly relations already existing between the peoples of Denmark and Norway, as well as Sweden, and English-speaking peoples everywhere may develop into closer relations of religious co-operation. Such co-operation would be specially valuable in the Mission field, where Norwegian missionaries are doing excellent work. There is also a large opening for such co-operation in the mercantile navies at sea, and in many seaports. Your Committee are aware that the Churches of the three countries are quite independent of

[1] It is important to notice that the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in the year 1904, passed a Canon (No. 42) enabling a Bishop to approve the use of services in a language other than the English language. Under this Canon the Bishops of that Church may license the use of the Liturgy of the Church of Sweden by any Swedish congregations which may place themselves under their care, and this licence has in fact been given in several American dioceses.

one another, but they believe that a closer approach to one of them might favourably affect our relations with the others.

VII

PRESBYTERIAN AND OTHER NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES

Many circumstances have led your Committee to pay special attention to the relations between the Presbyterian Churches and the Churches of the Anglican Communion. To many Presbyterians we owe a deep debt of gratitude for their contributions to sacred learning. We are equally indebted to them for many examples of holiness of life. With regard to their Churches, although their characteristics appear to vary in different countries, they have in many ways a special affinity with our own Communion. Wherever they have held closely to their traditions and professed standards of faith and government, as formulated at Westminster, they satisfy the first three of the four conditions of an approach to reunion laid down by the Lambeth Conference of 1888. Even as regards the fourth, though they have not retained "the historic episcopate," it belongs to their principles to insist upon definite ordination as necessary for admission into their ministry. Their standards provide that "the work of ordination" should be "performed with due care, wisdom, gravity, and solemnity" "by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting," by the presbytery; they regard and treat ordination as conferred by those who have themselves been ordained and are authorised to ordain others. Many leading Presbyterian divines maintain the transmission of Orders by a regular succession through the presbyterate. Facts such as these seem to point to the Presbyterian Churches as those among the non-episcopal bodies with whom it would be most natural and hopeful at the present time for our own Church to enter into closer relations. Indeed, your Committee have been informed that in Australia conferences have been already held between committees of the General Synod of our own Communion and of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church with a view to possible reunion.

Your Committee fully recognise that a condition precedent

to any project of reunion would be the attainment of a general agreement in doctrine and practice which would violate no essential principle of the Churches of our Communion. They admit that they are not satisfied that, except possibly in Australia, there is as yet evidence of a strong desire on the part of any of the Presbyterian Churches for a closer union with the Anglican Churches. The question of the recognition of Presbyterian orders seems to these Churches to present an insuperable obstacle. But the Committee feel that, before another Lambeth Conference can meet, the course of events may change the situation. In view of the possibilities of the future, they think that it would be a help to the cause of union to state that in their opinion it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of A.D. 1610.[1] Further arrangements would be necessary for the period of transition between the present condition of separation and full union on the basis of episcopal ordination. The Committee believe that such arrangements might be framed as would respect the convictions of those who had long and faithfully fulfilled their ministry in Presbyterian orders, without any surrender on our part of the essential principle, laid down in the Preface to our Ordinal, that those who are to minister the Word and Sacraments in the Churches of the Anglican Communion must have been episcopally ordained. In process of time the two streams of Christian life would mingle in the one Church, strengthened by the benefits which each of these contributory streams would be able to bring to the other.

Your Committee deliberately refrain from entering into any details, believing that these can only be profitably discussed when the spirit of unity has drawn the two bodies into closer fellowship with each other. But they have given very careful consideration to the matter, and they wish it to be understood that, in their opinion, members of the Presbyterian Churches who have, or may have, a real desire for fuller union with the Churches of our Communion may be assured that the way to such an arrangement as has been indicated

[1] In so far as these precedents involve consecration to the Episcopate *per saltum*, the conditions of such consecration would require careful investigation and statement.

above is not barred by obstacles which cannot be overcome by mutual considerateness, under the guidance of Him who is the Spirit alike of unity and truth.

Another remark may remove misunderstanding and make for peace. Anglican Churchmen must contend for a valid ministry as they understand it and regard themselves as absolutely bound to stipulate for this for themselves and for any Communion of which they are members. But it is no part of their duty, and therefore not their desire, to go further and pronounce negatively upon the value in God's sight of the ministry in other Communions.

Although for the reasons stated the Committee have given special attention to our relations with Presbyterian Churches, they have throughout their deliberations considered carefully and earnestly the relations between other non-episcopal Churches and the Churches of our Communion. With many of them, to whose ministers and members we owe, as to Presbyterians, many debts of gratitude for their learning and piety, and in whom we recognise manifold fruits of the Spirit, we desire to be associated in friendly intercourse and common service for the Kingdom of God. The Committee believe that few things tend more directly to godly union and concord than co-operation between members of different Communions in all matters pertaining to the social and moral welfare of the people. It is in the common service of humanity, in the name of Him who is its Lord, that the ties of friendly relationship are most readily created and most surely strengthened.

Further, in the opinion of the Committee much could be done to promote a more cordial mutual understanding, which is the necessary preliminary to all projects of reunion, if the members of our Communion would take pains to study the doctrines and appreciate the position of those who are separated from us, and would be careful to avoid in speech and act anything savouring of intolerance or arrogance. Towards this end, the Committee recommend that private meetings of ministers and laymen of our own and other Churches should frequently be held, such as those which have taken place under the auspices of the "Christian Unity Association" in Scotland, in which, by common study of the Word of God, by frank and friendly discussion, and by united

prayer, they could at once realise and deepen the sense of union in the fellowship of Christ. Meanwhile the Committee would commend to the Church an ideal of reunion which should include all the elements of divine truth now emphasised by separated bodies; in a word, the path of efforts towards reunion should be not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth, and the goal not uniformity but unity.

Finally, your Committee, recalling the words of the Report of the Committee on Church Unity appointed by the Lambeth Conference, 1897,[1] and of the Resolution of the Conference, No. 40,[2] venture to suggest that the constituted authorities of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion should, as opportunity offers, arrange conferences with representatives of different Christian bodies and meetings for united acknowledgment of the sins of division, and intercession for the growth of unity. Believing as they do that the Spirit of our Lord has been at this time calling us with special clearness to "consider seriously the dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions," they earnestly trust that one result of the present Conference may be a sustained effort to carry out this proposal in a spirit of humble faith, expectant hope, and patient charity.

JOHN SARUM,
Chairman.

[1] "We consider that the time has now arrived in which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession."

[2] "That the Bishops of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion be urged to appoint Committees of Bishops, where they have not been already appointed, to watch for opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian bodies and to give counsel where counsel may be asked in this matter. That these Committees confer with and assist each other and regard themselves as responsible for reporting to the next Lambeth Conference what has been accomplished in this respect."

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE PARSON'S HANDBOOK, for Parsons and others, on the Management of the Parish Church and its Services. Seventh Edition. Oxford University Press. 6*s.*

THE SERVER'S HANDBOOK, for Parish Clerks and Servers. Second Edition. Oxford University Press. 1*s.*

THE ENGLISH LITURGY, WITH ADDITIONAL COLLECTS, EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE BLACK LETTER DAYS, AND FOR SPECIAL OCCASIONS: An Altar Book by the Revs. Percy Dearmer, W. H. Frere, and the Ven. S. M. Taylor, with a Preface by the Bishop of Southwark. Second Edition. Rivingtons. 2 guineas, in sheets.

THE SANCTUARY. A Book for Communicants, with Private Devotions, &c. Second Edition. Rivingtons. 7*d.*, 1*s.*, 1*s.* 4*d.*, 2*s.* 6*d.*; with Prayer Book, 1*s.* 6*d.*, 2*s.*, 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE PRAYER BOOK: WHAT IT IS, AND HOW WE SHOULD USE IT. Third Edition Mowbrays. 1*d.* Illustrated Edition, 6*d.*

THE ORNAMENTS OF THE MINISTERS. With 41 Plates and 34 Figures. Mowbrays, 1908. 1*s.* 6*d.*

BODY AND SOUL: AN ENQUIRY INTO THE EFFECT OF RELIGION UPON HEALTH, WITH A DESCRIPTION OF CHRISTIAN WORKS OF HEALING FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT TO THE PRESENT DAY. 4th impression. Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1909. 6*s.*

EVERYMAN'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH. A popular History, copiously illustrated. Mowbrays, 1909. 1*s.*, 1*s.* 6*d.*, and 2*s.*

&c., &c.

Also the following forms of service:—

FIVE FORMS FOR BIDDING PRAYER. Mowbrays. 3*d.*

A FORM FOR UNCTION AND THE LAYING-ON OF HANDS. Mowbrays. 3*d.*

A MEMORIAL SERVICE. Mowbrays. 3*d.*

Also the following pamphlets:—

IS 'RITUAL' RIGHT? Mowbrays. 2*d.*

LOYALTY TO THE PRAYER BOOK. Mowbrays. 2*d.*

THE TRAINING OF A CHRISTIAN ACCORDING TO THE PRAYER BOOK AND CANONS. Mowbrays. 2*d.*

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS. Mowbrays. 2*d.* In cloth, 6*d.*

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH CATECHISM. Mowbrays. 1*d.*

PRINTED BY A. R. MOWBRAY AND CO. LTD.
LONDON AND OXFORD.

NOV 28 REC'D

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

APR 1 '61

283
D285

Dearmer, Percy
AUTHOR

Reunion and Rome.
TITLE

31151
Date Due | Borrower's Name

APR 1 '61 B. Wills

283
D285 Dearmer, Percy
Reunion and Rome.

31151